

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 024 862

AC 002 853

A Three Year Project of Training of Social Workers in Parent Group Education Leadership, 1963-64-65.  
Terminal Progress Report.

Child Study Association of America Inc., New York, N.Y.

Spons Agency- National Inst. of Mental Health (DHEW), Bethesda, Md.

Pub Date 65

Grant- NH-684-A1

Note- 76p.

EDRS Price MF- \$0.50 HC- \$3.90

Descriptors- \*Caseworkers, Child Psychology, Evaluation Techniques, \*Leadership Training, Low Income Groups, Measurement Instruments, \*Parent Education, Participant Characteristics, \*Professional Continuing Education, Publicize, Questionnaires, Scheduling, \*Social Agencies, Statistical Data

Identifiers- ENABLE

The three year project which trained social caseworkers for Parent Group Education Leadership was sponsored by the Child Study Association (responsible for training), and the Family Service Association of America which acted as an intermediary between various family agencies involved. The first year three-week training session emphasized the psychology of stages of development, while the second year emphasized discipline and Anna Freud's concept of transitional habits and objects. Trainees, parent groups, and agency administrators completed background, attitude, personality, and rating forms to continuously evaluate program and trainee progress. Various media were used to interest parents in classes. Participating parents felt positively about the class experience, and low income groups seemed to profit the most. Analysis of trainee testing data suggest that those who had the highest final rating were those who seemed to have changed the least during the training process. The majority of social agencies felt that parent education would remain a permanent part of the agency. (ENABLE, a low income parent education program and outgrowth of this project, is described.) (pt)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE  
OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE  
PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
POSITION OR POLICY.

A THREE YEAR PROJECT OF TRAINING OF SOCIAL WORKERS  
in  
PARENT GROUP EDUCATION LEADERSHIP\*

conducted by  
The Child Study Association of America

under the joint sponsorship  
of  
The Child Study Association of America  
and  
The Family Service Association of America

1963-64-65

TERMINAL PROGRESS REPORT

\*This project was supported by the National Institute  
of Mental Health under Grant Number MH 684 - A1

ED024862

AC00 2853

## Introduction

This report describes the impact and outcome of a three year project on the training of social caseworkers for Parent Group Education Leadership. The project was sponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health (Grant Number MH 684-A1) and conducted jointly by the Child Study Association of America (CSAA) and the Family Service Association of America (FSAA). The former group was responsible for the training activities while the latter acted as the intermediary between the various family agencies involved, relating the training experiences to the broader goals of these agencies and helping to interpret the nature and significance which they might have to the common pursuit of improved community services.

It was the general purpose of all parties to demonstrate how parent education might be utilized within the casework tradition of social agencies to make a significant contribution to the enhancement of mental health in a variety of local communities across the country. It was a preventative, rather than a treatment, orientation which provided the focus of both the training and the subsequent application of parent life education within the ongoing programs of the participating agencies. Consequently it is this preventative emphasis which provides the reference point from which the project can most realistically be viewed and evaluated.

This report will describe the various aspects of the project as they unfolded over a three year period starting with the delineation of the original interests of the two sponsoring agencies, through the recruitment of trainees from participating agencies, the training process, the activities of the trainees in their own agencies as parent group leaders, and concluding with follow-up data and an analysis of the implications of this project for future work in this area, with especial emphasis on Project ENABLE for which the present demonstration acted as the historical precursor.

## History of the Project

The FSAA and the CSAA, two voluntary national organizations with headquarters in New York City, had consulted with each other for a period of approximately two years prior to the date when the project was accepted for support by the National Institute of Mental Health. (1) Both agencies felt that each had something to offer the other in terms of establishing a project on a national level in training social workers for parent group education leadership. Due to various commitments that each of the agencies had to on-going programs, it was not until approximately one year prior to the submission of the request for funding that the agencies were able to see the possibilities of their working together to establish such a program.

- (1) All persons contributing to the development and conduct of the project are listed in APPENDIX "A".

cont'd.....

From the point of view of the CSAA the program was seen as another avenue for increasing the number of trained leaders in parent group education leadership. Although the CSAA is a national organization, it does not have any local affiliates through whom this type of preventive mental help approach to families could be based on a grass roots level.

The FSAA, on the other hand, through its 300 or more local affiliates, had the resources for establishing a program in family life education through their local agencies, but lacked the specialized leadership training experience that was required.

Both agencies realized that parent group education could be an effective preventive approach to community mental health on the part of the family agency. Further, they hoped that this approach would improve and extend the image of the family agency within the local communities and serve as a case-finding vehicle for those families who did not see themselves as having problems, but who, as a result of group participation under trained professional leadership, might be led to seek help.

It was with these objectives in mind that representatives of both agencies began a series of meetings to discuss what each agency could contribute to such a program. As a result of these meetings both agencies became convinced of the importance of developing a national training program. As a further result, discussions were held with members of the NIMH staff concerning the ideas that had been developed, and to obtain any guidance they could give in terms of clarification and refinement of the program on the basis of their experience with national programs of community service. On the basis of all these discussions a preliminary proposal was prepared. NIMH staff members went over this early draft of the proposal and indicated which points required clarification. They further suggested that a formal syllabus be prepared and tested out within the training institute. They felt that a syllabus of this sort could then be utilized by other agencies, should they feel a need to have some guidelines in understanding the necessary components involved in training for parent group education leadership.

The final draft of the formal proposal took approximately four months to prepare. In April of 1963 notification was received of acceptance of the proposal for funding by the National Institute of Mental Health.

#### Recruitment of Participating Agencies

The first major step to be taken in the implementation of the project was the recruitment of agencies who would send workers for training. In order to initiate this process the Family Service Association sent letters to all member agencies within a 1,000 mile radius of New York City informing them of the project. They asked

cont'd.....



them to indicate whether or not they might be interested in participating in the demonstration, and to also make any comments about it which they deemed to be appropriate. One hundred and thirteen (113) different social agencies responded to this request. Twenty four (24) agencies replied that they would be interested in participating in the project; thirty six (36) were uncertain while sixty three (63) replied that they would not. Almost half of those who were uncertain indicated that staff shortages were responsible for this reaction and about one fifth thought they would like to participate in the program the following year. Among the agencies replying in the negative almost half also explained their action in terms of insufficient staff. In addition, about 10% noted that they were already participating in other projects which presumably limited their ability to extend their efforts further.

As the negotiations proceeded, eight (8) of the agencies originally interested in participating withdrew from the project, generally because of the travel and maintenance costs required from the agency, or due to unexpected staff shortages. Eighteen (18) agencies were finally selected for the project by a committee of staff and board members of the two sponsoring groups -- FSAA and CSAA. These agencies, as well as those participating in the second year, are listed in APPENDIX "B".

It is of some interest to examine how these eighteen participating agencies compared to other agencies who did not participate. Did these groups have any background characteristic which set them apart from each other? This issue is of importance in understanding the problems inherent in the recruitment process and in directing such efforts more fruitfully in the future, so that other investigators pursuing similar ends would know whether they ought to direct their recruitment efforts to specialized groups if they wished to enhance their likelihood of a successful outcome. Or conversely, if such differences exist it would clarify which agencies are least likely to be interested, and therefore would require specialized attention if their participation is essential to the project.

A series of eight (8) comparisons were made between the 18 participating agencies and a total of 256 FSAA member agencies drawn from their geographic area. The Z test and the Kolmogorov-Smirnow test were used to detect significant differences. Only two of these comparisons were significantly at the .05 level; the size of professional and administrative staff, and the percentage of agencies offering family life education programs. The agencies participating had larger administrative and professional staffs and were more likely to have an already existing program in family life education than non-participating agencies. These differences are quite reasonable. Agencies with larger staffs are more likely to have someone who can be spared for training. Similarly, agencies with experience in family life education are more likely to appreciate its value and be interested in improving their already existing programs.

cont'd.....

On the six other characteristics no differences were found. These included population size of community served, percent of agencies with a waiting list, percent of agencies offering child welfare services, percent of agencies which are sectarian, percent of all terminations in cases which involved in-person contact with family, and percent of such terminations in which six or more interviews were conducted. However, it should be noted that the agencies serving the largest communities tended to be non-participants, though this finding did not quite reach the level of significance. This tendency may have been due to the fact that many of the largest agencies already had leadership training programs of their own in family life education.

From these data it seems reasonable to conclude that the participating agencies were generally typical of the membership of FSAA with the exception of their larger professional staff size and greater interest in the particular kind of program involved in the demonstration. This observation is important in generalizing the results of the study to a broader population. It should also be remembered that this analysis is based only on the first year participants. During the second year the participating agencies became more representative geographically of the nation as a whole and thus increased the breadth of the population studied even further.

#### The Training of Parent Group Leaders

At the conclusion of the initial selection process the 18 agencies were notified of their acceptance in the program. The formal bibliography and various reading materials were sent to the workers who had been selected. They also received a memorandum from CSAA outlining the necessary steps in recruitment of two parent groups to be established by them immediately following the three week institute. All of these materials are provided in APPENDIX "C".

The general form of the training program had previously been described as part of the original application made to NIMH, but a number of modifications were introduced in the interval in order to relate the general approach which had been developed from other leadership training experiences to the particular needs and strengths of the social workers participating in this project. The full Syllabus is given in APPENDIX "D". An outline of the three weeks schedule of the training institute is given in Table 1. This outline illustrates the unique integration of group training activities with the basic scientific materials presented through lecture and discussion, that characterizes the leadership training approach developed by the Child Study Association of America.

As part of their initial preparation for the training session, each trainee completed a Background Information Questionnaire providing data about professional training and previous experience. This information is summarized in Table 2, which also includes parallel information for the second group of trainees who participated during the following year for purposes of comparison.

cont'd.....

TABLE 1

TRAINING PROGRAM FOR FAMILY CASEWORKERS IN PARENT GROUP EDUCATION LEADERSHIP  
Fall 1964

## Calendar of Theoretical Sessions, Seminars and Observation Periods

## FIRST WEEK

Monday 10/5	Tuesday 10/6	Wednesday 10/7	Thursday 10/8	Friday 10/9
9-10:30 A. M. Opening Session	9-10:30 A. M. Establishing Group Atmos- phere and First Meetings	O B S E R V A T I O N	9-10:30 A. M. What is Involved in Parent- Child Relation- ships	9-10:30 A. M. Transitional Habits and Objects
Coffee 10:30	Coffee 10:30		Coffee 10:30	Coffee 10:30
10:45-12:00 ORIENTATION	10:45-12:00 Group Records		10:45-12:00 Seminar	10:45-12:00 Group Records
12:00-1 P. M. Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
1-2:30 P. M. Parent Group Education: Philosophy Principles & Goals	1-2:30 P. M. Planning for Groups	1-2:30 P. M. Small Group Discussions re: Observations	1-2:30 P. M. Film Clip of a Parent Group	1-2:30 P. M. Group Records
Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30
2:45-4 P. M. Seminar	2:45-4 P. M. Seminar	2:45-4 P. M. Role of the Leader	2:45-4 P. M. Seminar	2:45-4 P. M. Seminar

cont'd.....

TABLE 1, cont'd

SECOND WEEK, OCTOBER 12 - 16

Monday 10/12	Tuesday 10/13	Wednesday 10/14	Thursday 10/15	Friday 10/16
9-10:30 A. M. Developing Content	9-10:30 A. M. Issues of Discipline, Birth through 9 Years	O B S E R V A T I O N	9-10:30 A. M. Use of Casework and Groupwork Concepts	9-10:30 A. M. The Meaning of Individual Behavior in Group
Coffee 10:30	Coffee 10:30		Coffee 10:30	Coffee 10:30
10:45-12:00 Group Records	10:45-12:00 Seminar		10:45-12:00 Group Records	10:45-12:00 Seminar
12:00-1 P. M. Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
1-2:30 P. M. Sex Education	1-2:30 P. M. Issues of Discipline 9 Years to young Adulthood	1-2:30 P. M. Small Group Discussions	1-2:30 P. M. Group Interaction	1-2:30 P. M. How do you handle person with specific problem
Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30



TABLE 1, cont'd

THIRD WEEK, OCTOBER 19 - 23

Monday 10/19	Tuesday 10/20	Wednesday 10/21	Thursday 10/22	Friday 10/23
9-10:30 A. M. Single meetings etc.....	9-10:30 A. M. Social Needs of Children	O B S E R V A T I O N	9-10:15 A. M. Seminar	9-10:30 A. M. Research
Coffee 10:30	Coffee 10:30		Coffee 10:15	Coffee 10:30
10:45-12:00 Seminar	10:45-12:00 Seminar		10:30-12:00 Cultural and Social Variations	10:45-12:00 Seminar
12:00-1 P. M. Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch	Lunch
1-2:30 P. M. Group Record	1-2:30 P. M. Special Problems Divorce, Separation, etc....	1-2:30 P. M. Small Groups	1-2:30 P. M. Seminar	1-2:30 P. M. Seminar
Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30	Coffee 2:30
2:45-4 P. M. Educational Issues	2:45-4 P. M. Group Record	2:45-4 P. M. Seminar	2:45-4 P. M. Group Record	

\*\*\*\*\*

TABLE 2

## BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF TRAINEES

1.	<u>Age</u>	<u>26-30</u>	<u>31-35</u>	<u>36-40</u>	<u>41-45</u>	<u>46-50</u>	<u>51-55</u>	<u>56-60</u>	<u>61-65</u>
	1st Year	1	1	3	3	2	4	3	1
	2nd Year	3	2	1	4	1	5	1	1
2.	<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Single</u>	<u>Married</u>		<u>Widowed</u>		<u>Divorced</u>		
	1st Year	7	9		1		1		
	2nd Year	5	10		3		0		
3.	<u>Number of Children</u>	<u>0</u>		<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	
	1st Year	10		3	4	1	0	0	
	2nd Year	7		6	2	2	0	1	
4.	<u>Religion</u>	<u>Protestant</u>		<u>Catholic</u>		<u>Jewish</u>		<u>None</u>	
	1st Year	9		2		4		3	
	2nd Year	9		2		4		3	
5.	<u>Education</u>								

Number of Courses in Different Areas

Number of Courses	<u>Understanding Individual</u>		<u>Parent-Child Relationships</u>		<u>Education</u>		<u>Social Sciences</u>	
	1st Yr.	2nd Yr.	1st Yr.	2nd Yr.	1st Yr.	2nd Yr.	1st Yr.	2nd Yr.
0	1	0	0	1	5	5	1	0
1	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0
2	1	0	1	1	5	2	2	2
3	0	0	3	1	2	2	5	4
4	1	2	3	2	0	1	1	2
5	3	0	2	0	1	1	1	2
6	2	3	3	3	0	1	2	1
7	0	4	0	3	0	0	2	1
8	1	2	2	2	2	1	0	3
9 or more	9	7	4	5	1	1	3	3

cont'd....

TABLE 2, cont'd

6. Average Length of Employment

Years:	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	or more
1st Year	1	2	4	1	2	0	0	4	4	
2nd Year	1	3	2	4	3	1	2	0	2	

7. Rating of the Amount of Experience in Groups

	(1) no experience			(4) an average amount			(7) a great deal
rating:	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>
1st Year	2	3	2	2	1	2	6
2nd Year	3	2	1	3	4	2	3

8. Sex

	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>
1st Year	<u>3</u>	<u>15</u>
2nd Year	7	11

In general the two sets of trainees were quite similar. The first group contained fewer men and had a slightly longer average period of employment than the second, but other differences between the two groups were slight. One is struck as much by the variety of previous experience and background characteristics as anything else. It would seem reasonable to draw the preliminary conclusion that any effects experienced by these trainees would be likely to occur when similar programs are conducted elsewhere, because of the heterogeneity of their background characteristics.

### The First Training Institute

It is difficult, and perhaps not even realistic, to attempt to convey the precise character of a complex three week experience for 18 trainees and various trainers and consultants. A wide range of reactions inevitably occurred to a variety of different situations. However, in retrospect, certain events can be recalled that may help to provide the reader with some general orientation.

The trainees found that one of the main benefits which they received from the institute was that it gave them an opportunity to look at their own attitudes about family interaction and to work out their reactions towards certain types of parent education interventions. They reported to the trainers that the experience allowed them to think through, sometimes for the first time, how they felt about certain types of group members, certain kinds of problem situations, and their difficulty in identifying certain kinds of feelings of which they had to be aware in their work with parents. Another aspect of the experience which they found important was the opportunity to look at how they perceived their own participation in the training group and in other groups to which they had belonged in the past. This perception helped them to see why the varying reactions of parents in their own groups might emerge, and how these might be handled beneficially, both for the parents and also for themselves as group leaders. They also became aware of their own fears in relation to being a leader, their own concerns with being the authority figure in a group situation. These general trends can best be illustrated by specific examples.

One trainee reported her great sense of guilt about how she had reared her own children. She was able to see what seemed like an ideal marriage situation was contributing to her own feelings of ambivalence about her children which she became able to view as a universal kind of experience that many parents might feel. Another trainee reported that what at first seemed like intellectual interest in getting at specifics with regard to how one handles certain situations in parent groups was really a means of avoiding the exploration of feelings. Another trainee reported that his desire for greater activity on the part of the trainers was his way of feeling the need to overcome uncertainty and a way of making him feel more competent. Other trainees were able to see their strong feeling that parents should be given more information rather than fully exploring the parents' own reactions was related to a concern with not being liked by

cont'd.....



the parents in their groups, of not being the "authority." They came to see that they had doubted the ability of parents to think through issues for themselves or to appreciate that this process would eventually have greater meaning for them than being told by rote the meanings of certain types of behavior.

The preceding observations were drawn from the subjective recollections of the trainers. At the same time a more objective approach was taken to the same material. Each of the trainees was asked to complete a Daily Reaction Form several times during the training institute, as well as a Terminal Reaction Form at the end of the three week period. The data obtained from these forms are summarized in Tables 3 and 4.

The first question on the Daily Reaction Form involved those aspects of the training which were seen as particularly helpful. In the first week of the first institute only 4% of the comments indicated that the interchange of experience in the group was of great help. During the second week of the institute, the percentage rose to 32%.

During the third week the percentage fell to 18%. Evidently this kind of activity is seen as most useful during the middle of the institute, before practical experience has occurred, but after preliminary training efforts had already taken place.

A slightly different picture occurred in relation to attitudes towards lectures. During the first week of the institute 4% found them helpful. During the second week the percentage had risen slightly to 10%. But during the third week the percentage rose to 25%, indicating that either the lectures slowly improved, or that the trainees were gaining the background experience that enabled them to appreciate the material presented in the lectures.

Finally, during the first week of the institute 54% felt that the opportunity to watch actual groups in operation was of great assistance. In the second week, the percentage fell to 32%. Evidently, the need to observe parent groups was at least partly met by the early experience and did not require much repetition.

The trainees felt that a wide variety of different training aspects were not helpful, but there was little common agreement among the trainees themselves as to what they were, so that generalizations are difficult to make.

When asked if they felt that any of the material was repetitious, practically all who responded felt that it was. However, their reaction to this repetition altered with time. During the first week they simply agreed that repetition occurred. However, by the third week they added that review of materials brought firmer understanding.

When interpreting these reactions one must remember both when and where they were obtained and make suitable allowances for these differences. At the end of the first week of training many trainees were in a state of confusion, tending to be overwhelmed by the barrage of new information and experiences to which they have been exposed. Toward the end of the third week a good deal of this confusion had dispursed.

cont'd.....

TABLE 3

DAILY REACTION FORM

	<u>1st</u> <u>Week</u>	<u>2nd</u> <u>Week</u>	<u>3rd</u> <u>Week</u>
1. What aspects of today's sessions did you find most helpful?			
Interchange of experiences	1	6	3
Lecture	1	2	4
Observation	14	6	0
Problem of content and agenda	4	0	5
Leadership Role	0	0	2
Recruitment	0	0	1
Special Problems (handicapped)	0	0	1
Theory	4	1	0
No Response	2	4	0
2. Which aspects were least helpful?			
Specific case not helpful	-	4	3
Materials presented insufficient	--	-	4
Re: screening	-	-	1
Re: low-income group	-	-	1
Discussion	3	-	3
Specific topics not valuable	5	2	-
Sexual development	-	1	-
Fees	1	-	-
Child 1-3	1	-	-
Role of leader	1	-	-
Group record	2	1	-
Lecture	2	-	-
No material helpful	1	-	-
No response	6	7	3
3. Did you find parts of today's session that were repetitions of materials which you have already learned here or elsewhere? Please explain.			
Yes	16	12	8
(a) but increased understanding	3	7	7
(b) lecture on child development	6	2	-
(c) emphasis on pathology	1	-	-
No	-	1	1
No response	2	-	4

cont'd.....

TABLE 3 cont'd

	<u>1st</u> <u>Week</u>	<u>2nd</u> <u>Week</u>	<u>3rd</u> <u>Week</u>
4. Did you find parts of today's sessions that gave you new knowledge, points of view or challenged your previous opinions or attitudes? Please explain.			
Lecture helpful	-	3	2
Leader's responsibility to grow	-	-	5
Seminars about content	1	-	-
Seminars about process	6	1	-
Classifications of aims	1	-	-
Special groups	2	-	4
No response	3	7	1
5. Could the material that was presented today be taught in a more effective manner?			
No	4	1	2
Specific case material should be presented earlier and fuller	1	3	1
More observation and discussion of observation	-	-	3
Material should be improved, re:			
a) theoretical alterations	1	-	-
b) leadership problems	-	-	3
Critical of curriculum speakers	1	3	-
Delineation of lecture - discussion should be sharper	1	-	-
No response	3	8	3

\*\*\*\*\*

TABLE 4

TERMINAL REACTIONS OF TRAINEES  
(First Year, First Training Session)

## 1. Which aspects of the training experience were most helpful?

Specific presentations.....	21
(Lectures about philosophy and techniques of parent group education)	17
Film presentation.....	4
Case record.....	3
Sessions with CSAA staff.....	1
None.....	1

## 2. Which aspects were least helpful?

Most presentations by outside speakers.....	25
Philosophy, method, technique.....	3
Case material.....	2

## 3. Which aspects require further emphasis?

Group dynamics.....	10
Recruitment.....	6
More observation and discussion.....	7
Better film clip.....	1
No response.....	1

## 4. In which aspects of parent group education do you feel least prepared?

Leadership problems.....	17
with process.....	7
with individuals.....	5
with special educational groups.....	5
Recruitment.....	2
Unable to evaluate.....	2
Lack of experience.....	1
No response.....	1

## 5. In which do you feel best prepared?

Technique of leadership.....	10
Purpose.....	6
Adequately in all areas.....	2
Recruitment and organization.....	2
Don't know.....	2

## 6. In general do you feel that the training program is worthwhile?

Yes.....	16
Don't know.....	1



Similarly, the evaluations obtained from the trainees while they were at the institute were bound to be rather different than those made when they returned to their home agency and resumed their normal routine.

At the end of the first training institute, trainees were asked to complete a Terminal Reaction Form after they had returned home, to express their retrospective view of that experience. When asked which aspects of the training experience were most helpful, a wide variety of responses were forthcoming, but there was little general agreement. However, to the converse question "which were least helpful," there was general agreement. 83% felt that with few exceptions the lectures were inadequate.

These responses should not necessarily be taken at face value. As mentioned in a later section a variety of interpretations can be suggested other than the obvious one. For example, the caseworkers may have been bored by material that was already familiar to them. This kind of material was most frequently presented by the guest lecturers. Under these conditions it is difficult to separate the familiarity of the material from the effectiveness of guest lectures when analyzing the nature of the trainees' reactions.

When asked if there were materials that should have been more fully presented, again considerable disagreement was evidenced, but 24% felt the need for greater preparation in the problems relating to recruitment of parent groups.

Finally, when asked to give their overall assessment of the training program, all but one of the trainees felt that it was worth while and she reported that she was not yet sure what she thought.

#### The Effect of the Training Experience on the Trainees

It was not one of the formal goals of the project to subject the whole training program to formal evaluation. Nevertheless, there was an interest in understanding the way in which the trainees were influenced by the training and the identification of characteristics which determined the extent of this influence. For purpose of this general investigation a number of instruments were developed or adapted. These instruments and the 52 variables which they measured are listed in Table 5.

The instruments themselves are provided in APPENDIX "E". There were basically five measuring devices that were employed though some of them were used in several ways or completed by different sets of individuals. The Background Questionnaire was completed by the trainees before coming to the institute and has already been discussed. Only those items which could be scaled were included in the present analysis.

cont'd.....

TABLE 5

THE VARIABLES USED TO MEASURE TRAINEE PERFORMANCE

Background Characteristics

1. Age
2. Number of children in family
3. Number of courses taken on "Understanding the Individual"
4. Number of courses taken on "Parent-Child Relations"
5. Number of courses taken in Education
6. Number of courses taken in the Social Sciences
7. Average length of employment
8. Amount of experience in working with groups

Personality Rating Form - completed by trainers

Pre-Training:

9. Assertiveness
10. Sociability
11. Emotionality
12. Intelligence

Post Institute Training:

13. Assertiveness
14. Sociability
15. Emotionality
16. Intelligence

Personality Rating Form - completed by Agency heads

Pre-Training:

17. Assertiveness
18. Sociability
19. Emotionality
20. Intelligence

Personality Rating Form - completed by trainees

Pre-Training:

21. Assertiveness
22. Sociability
23. Emotionality
24. Intelligence

Post Institute Training:

25. Assertiveness
26. Sociability
27. Emotionality
28. Intelligence

Trainee Rating Form - completed by trainees

Pre-Training:

29. Knowledge about parent education
30. Attitude toward parent education
31. Ability to lead parent groups

Post Institute Training:

32. Knowledge about parent education
33. Attitude toward parent education
34. Ability to lead parent groups

TABLE 5 cont'd...

Trainee Rating Form - completed by trainers

Post Institute Training:

- 35. Knowledge about parent education
- 36. Attitude toward parent education
- 37. Ability to lead parent groups
- 38. Self understanding

Post Parent Group Leadership:

- 39. Knowledge about parent education
- 40. Attitude toward parent education
- 41. Ability to lead parent groups
- 42. Self understanding

Personality Questionnaire

Pre-Training:

- 43. Ascendence
- 44. Sociability
- 45. Emotional stability
- 46. Objectivity

Parental Attitude Research Instrument

- 47. Authoritarian Control - Pre-Training
- 48. Authoritarian Control - Post Training
- 49. Hostility Rejection - Pre-Training
- 50. Hostility Rejection - Post Training
- 51. Democratic Attitude - Pre-Training
- 52. Democratic Attitude - Post Training

\*\*\*\*\*

The Personality Rating Form was used by the trainees and by the trainers to describe the trainees both before and after the institute and by the agency administrators to describe the trainees before training. This Form is the product of a series of factor analytic studies of the use of ratings in the evaluation of human interaction. In 1954 Carter (1) summarized a series of investigations bearing on this question and concluded that three factors described most of the variance involved in the observable description of human interaction. Later studies by Borgatta, Cottrell, and Mann (2) and by Borgatta (3) have further replicated and clarified the nature of the factors involved. In particular the investigation by Borgatta (3) using five independent replications has indicated that the factors of Individual Assertiveness, Sociability, Intelligence, and Emotionality account for most of the measurable interaction in a variety of different social situations. The present rating form is derived directly from these studies. Each of the four factors is measured by the use of rating criteria highly loaded on one or another of these factors. All factors are measured by independent criteria to ensure maximum degree of independence of the four scales. The result of this procedure is to produce a relatively short scale that measures a great amount of important material in the most efficient manner.

The Trainee Rating Form was used both by trainees and trainers to describe the relative status of the trainees on four variables after the institute and also after they had led their first two groups on four variables. Direct ratings were made on the variables measured.

The Personality Questionnaire is the product of a considerable amount of research in personality assessment and measurement. A great number of self-administered personality tests have been produced as a result of this kind of research. Probably the most satisfactory of these tests from the point of view of comprehensiveness of coverage, clarity of measurement and efficiency of design are the Cattell 16 factor Personality Questionnaire, the Edward Personal Preference Survey, the Thurstone Temperament Schedule, and the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Each of these tests reliably measures approximately 12 different independent personality variables. Little was known until recently about the relation of these tests to one another and the extent to which they measured the same thing using

- (1) Carter, L.F. Recording and evaluating the performance of individuals as members of small groups. Personnel Psychology, 1954 - 7, 477-484.
- (2) Borgatta, E.F., Cottrell, L.S., Jr. and Mann, J.H. The spectrum of individual interaction characteristics: an inter-dimensional analysis. Psychol. Reports, 1958 - 4, 279-317. Monograph Supp. #4.
- (3) Borgatta, E.F. Rankings and Self-Assessments: Some Behavioral Characteristics Replication Studies, in press.

cont'd.....



different questions. In order to clarify this issue Borgatta (1) has recently given all four tests to 82 male and 32 female subjects in order to compare the tests directly with each other. To his great surprise he discovered that most of the common variance measured by all these carefully formulated instruments could be covered by two large clusters of subtests which he called "Extraversion" and "Emotional Stability." He found that over half of the 50 odd subtests derived from the four personality tests could be included in one or the other of these two clusters. The implication of this finding is that when personality is measured by the use of a self-administered test for the most part the measurement obtained is a mixture of these two basic clusters. The most efficient procedure would appear therefore to be to obtain independent measures of each cluster so that a simple efficient and interpretable result could be obtained. The Personality Questionnaire represents such an approach to personality measurement. It measures both "extraversion" and "emotional stability" by utilizing two subtests highly related to each cluster as the basis for assessment. In this case the A (ascendence) and S (sociability) scales from the Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey are used to measure extraversion; the O (objectivity) and E (emotional stability) scales from the same test are used to measure emotional stability. These scales give direct estimates of the clusters described by over thirty (30) of the subtests in the four well-established and well-designed personality scales. The present test therefore represents an astonishing condensation of a vast amount of research in the area of personality assessment and is extremely efficient as a personality measure.

The fifth instrument was the Parental Attitude Research Instrument (PARI). Factor analytic studies of this instrument have demonstrated that the Inventory measures three general factors. (2) These factors were measured by summing the scores of subscales on which they are most highly loaded, as follows: Authoritarian Control (martyrdom, excluding outside influences, suppression of sexuality), Hostility-Rejection (irritability, rejection of the homemaking role), and Democratic Attitudes (encouraging verbalization, equalitarianism, comradeship and sharing).

A sixth instrument was also included in the original battery. This instrument was designed to assess adequacy of leadership behavior in parent education groups. It had the advantage of being constructed to fit the CSAA Leadership Training approach but the disadvantage of never having been standardized. The present project seemed to provide a good opportunity to carry its development toward a further stage of precision.

- (1) Borgatta, E.F. The Coincidence of Subtest in Four Personality Inventories, in press.
- (2) Zuckerman, M., Ribback, Beatrice B., Monashkin, I. and Norton, J.A. Normative data and factor analysis on the Parental Attitude Research Instrument. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1958, 22, 165-171.

cont'd.....

Unfortunately an item analysis of the questionnaire on both samples of trainees suggested that the items were extremely unreliable and lacked any consistent pattern of relationships from sample to sample. No attempt was therefore made to include data from these questionnaires in the final analysis though the questionnaire itself is given in APPENDIX "E".

The data derived from these instruments were intercorrelated. The full correlation matrix is given in APPENDIX "F".

Of these 1300 correlations, thirty seven (37) were found to exceed .59, which is significant at the .01 level for an N of 18. Only the more important of these relationships will be discussed here.

The number of courses previously taken by the trainees in various content areas was found to relate to underlying personality characteristics and also to the reaction which they had to certain aspects of the training experience. Specifically the number of courses taken by the trainers in the area of Understanding the Individual related to the assertiveness of the trainee measured on the Personality Questionnaire. Further, the number of courses which they had taken in parent-child relations related positively to their initial and post institute attitude toward parent education as well as their post institute assessment of their knowledge about parent group leadership. Thus those who were best informed in this area felt most predisposed toward recognizing its value and felt they learned the most from the experience, at least on the cognitive level.

The ratings made by the trainers of the trainees related to a number of variables including themselves, each other, the trainees' own ratings, and test scores on the standardized instruments. Three of the four ratings correlated highly with themselves when pre and post institute scores were compared. In addition, the assertiveness measure was related to both the sociability and intelligence rating at the initial measurement period but not when these variables were measured after the institute. Evidently increased familiarity with the trainees enabled the trainers to rate with greater discrimination and less reliance on halo effects.

The only relation noted between the trainers and trainees ratings was between trainers pre-rating and trainees post-rating on the variable of sociability. In other respects the self-ratings and the ratings of the trainers were unrelated, suggesting that their viewpoints were relatively independent.

An association occurred between trainer ratings of trainee on emotionality made before the institute and a lack of sociability as indicated by the Personality Test. Also noted was a fairly strong relation (.71) between high initial sociability ratings of trainees by trainers and low post institute scores on the PARI variable of Authoritarian control. Two other relations between trainer ratings and PARI scores also occurred. The first was an inverse relation between the pre-institute rating by the trainers of the trainees Intelligence

cont'd....

and the post institute trainee score on the PARI-Hostility-Rejection scale. The second was more puzzling. Trainers post institute ratings of trainees on assertiveness were inversely related to PARI scores on Authoritarian Control, i.e., trainees high on assertiveness were low on authoritarian attitudes which suggests an inconsistency between observed behavior and general child rearing attitudes.

The ratings made by the agency supervisors of their own workers related only to each other. Specifically, Sociability was related to Assertiveness and Intelligence, which exactly parallels the previously noted relations that trainers ratings of trainees had with each other.

The Self-ratings made by the trainees were, in addition to those relationships already mentioned, correlated with themselves pre-post, each other, and with the PARI. The pre-post measures of Intelligence and emotionality were related to themselves. The post but not the pre measures of Assertiveness correlated with emotionality and Intelligence; as while Intelligence was related to assertiveness and Emotionality. The relationship between intelligence and emotionality in the latter cluster was negative. Finally, the trainee who rated himself high on intelligence before training also was high on the Democratic scale of the PARI given at that time. This relationship however did not persist through the training experience.

An interesting relation existed between the post institute trainers assessment of the ability of the trainees to lead parent groups and the trainees self-assessment on this ability after they had actually led groups. In this one instance the view of the trainers is a predictor of the self view of the trainee at a later time. This finding is an interesting example of an out of phase predictive relationship. At any given point in time the two variables were unrelated. But comparing measures obtained at different times suggests that trainers tend to describe what will be, while the trainees are referring to what has been.

There were a variety of relationships between the trainee and also the trainer ratings of the trainees' knowledge about, attitudes towards, and ability to lead parent groups, and also their self-understanding. This overlap can be taken to indicate either the existence of a strong halo effect, a good deal of actual relationship between the ratings; or both influences acting simultaneously.

In summary, this analysis helps to clarify a number of different issues of basic importance in interpreting the data obtained. First, it indicates the extent to which the variables measured by a given instrument are actually different. Second, it clarifies the extent to which different instruments are apparently duplicating each other by measuring the same thing. Third, it determines the extent to which pre-measures can be used to predict post measure on the same and other variables. Finally, and more generally, it gives some understanding of the relationship between different levels of measurement, e.g., how attitudes relate to behavior.

cont'd.....



In addition to the correlational analysis, it seemed natural to compare mean shifts on all variables measured before and after the three week training experience to test for evidence of change. It was not anticipated that much, if any, change would be detected over such a short period, but one could not be sure before the fact. A t-test for correlated means was used for all comparisons. The variables tested and the results obtained are summarized in Table 6. None of the differences were significant. These particular instruments therefore do not indicate trainee change over the period of the first institute. Since a control group was not available, the meaning of these data must remain somewhat ambiguous in any case, since even positive findings might be explained on the basis of extraneous events, or test-experience interaction.

### Post Institute Reactions

Immediately after the conclusion of the three week training institute all trainees returned home and went about establishing their own parent education groups. This experience will be described in a subsequent section. During this time weekly written reports were sent by trainees to members of CSAA staff who acted as their supervisors. The supervisors made at least one site visit to observe the trainees in action, as well as corresponding with them in order to provide written comments on their reports.

This system of long distance supervision combined with periodic site visits represented a departure from previous training practices and seemed to be unusually successful. Many trainees spontaneously indicated that they benefited more from this kind of supervision than from any other feature of the training experience. The continuity which it provided seemed to create the necessary opportunity for the transference of learning and integration of theory with practice.

It should also be noted that during this period, as well as throughout the project, representatives of the two sponsoring agencies were meeting periodically, both for purposes of communication and to test the realism and validity of the training activities then being pursued from their differing vantage points. This continuous interaction of the two staffs proved vital for the success of the project, since neither party could go further than the limit set by the understanding of the other in making a constructive contribution to the total process.

In March of 1965 a one week follow-up institute was conducted. All trainees returned to CSAA headquarters to discuss their parent group experiences and to receive further training. The major focus of this session was on a series of "Problems in Leadership of Parent Group Education" which had been drawn together from the weekly reports of the trainees. This material (see APPENDIX "G") was sent to each trainee before the institute and formed the basis of group discussion during the five day period.

At the conclusion of the institute another Terminal Reaction Form was administered. The results are reported in Table 7.

cont'd....



TABLE 6

Pre-Post Comparisons of Trainee Performance

<u>Variables</u>	<u>Pre-Training</u>		<u>Post Training</u>	
	Mean	Standard Deviation	Mean	Standard Deviation
<u>Trainer Ratings</u>				
1. Assertiveness	3.44	1.01	3.11	.94
2. Sociability	3.28	.80	3.39	.95
3. Emotionality	4.50	.60	4.22	.85
4. Intelligence	3.05	.91	3.00	.94
<u>Trainee Ratings</u>				
5. Assertiveness	3.11	.87	3.00	.74
6. Sociability	2.22	.73	2.33	.82
7. Emotionality	4.83	1.01	5.00	.88
8. Intelligence	2.50	.76	2.55	.83
9. Knowledge of parent education	1.50	.76	2.28	1.20
10. Attitude toward parent education	2.61	1.42	3.75	1.53
11. Leadership ability	2.33	.88	3.05	1.04
<u>Trainer Ratings</u>				
12. Knowledge of parent education	3.44	.83	3.47	.89
13. Attitude toward parent education	3.83	1.01	4.03	.95
14. Leadership ability	3.72	.99	3.55	1.16
15. Self understanding	4.44	1.06	5.33	1.15
<u>P A R I</u>				
16. Authoritarian control	4.05	.78	3.89	.81
17. Hostility rejection	4.83	1.46	5.11	1.45
18. Democratic attitude	6.06	1.68	6.89	1.33

\*\*\*\*\*

TABLE 7

TERMINAL REACTIONS OF TRAINEES  
(First year, Second Training Session)

1. Which aspects of the training experience were most helpful?	
Group discussion technique.....	9
Observation of groups.....	6
Specific presentations.....	6
Sessions with CSAA staff.....	2
Case record.....	1
2. Which aspects were least helpful?	
Lectures inadequate (seminar disorganized).....	11
Don't know at this time.....	1
3. Which aspects require further emphasis?	
Group dynamics.....	9
Recruiting and public relations.....	5
Normal child development.....	1
Case record.....	1
4. In which aspects of parent group education do you feel least prepared?	
Lack of experience.....	5
Concept of group social work.....	3
Organization and recruitment.....	1
Understanding of meaning of group interaction.....	1
Can't answer till experienced.....	1
5. In which do you feel best prepared?	
Personality and psycho-sex development.....	4
Techniques of leadership.....	3
Establish rapport.....	3
Recruitment and organization.....	1
6. In general do you feel that the training program is worthwhile?	
Yes.....	13
No.....	2

\*\*\*\*\*

In general, they supported the conclusions previously noted favoring the use of group sessions and criticizing the lack of integration of seminars and lecture material with the training process. In relation to this reaction a heightened recognition was noted of the need for further training in the diagnosis and handling of group dynamics. In general, the overall response to the program continued to be favorable as indicated by the replies to Question 6.

### The Second Year of the Training Process

It had originally been planned that the second year of the training process would be a repetition of the first with an equivalent group of trainees. But the first year's experience, as well as certain recruitment problems with the second year trainees, introduced some alterations in the training design.

A review of the trainees reactions during the first year, which have already been described, as well as informal discussions among the CSAA staff, suggested certain alterations in the Syllabus.

The main shift during the second year from the previous emphasis on the psychology of various stages of development as presented by guest lecturers, was toward choosing topics that the social workers seemed to have difficulty in fully understanding and relating them to the usual "normal" problems that parents face in day-to-day rearing of their children. For this purpose the concept of transitional habits and objects as presented by Anna Freud in her discussion of lines of development, was applied. This approach was used not to explore one particular stage of development but rather to help the social workers view all of the general growth stages of children in a different light. Therefore, the concept of transitional habits was applied to a variety of topics such as pacifiers, favorite toys, blankets, lint picking, thumb sucking, tongue sucking, rocking, head banging, nail biting, enuresis, problems of speech, sloppiness, various compulsive and obsessional traits such as collecting things concerned with baseball scores, combing of hair, not showering, or obsessive showering. It was felt that as they came to understand this general approach the social workers would be able to communicate with the parents more satisfactorily about the limits of normal child behavior. At the same time this approach was designed to help the social workers understand what the child was experiencing developmentally and be more aware of the issues which the parent may or may not be facing at the time, both in his relation to the child and indirectly in his own life.

The other area that seemed of great importance for the workers, and one in which they had difficulty in the previous year, concerned the issue of discipline. This topic was broken up into two stages: a) discipline from birth to nine years, and b) from ten years to young adulthood. Within the topic of discipline for the young child a variety of different issues were examined, including questions relating to toilet training, biting, hitting, taking of toys by the pre-school child, getting youngsters to do their homework and carry out chores,

cont'd.....

problems of allowance, taking care of their own rooms and toys, sibling rivalry, and mothers' constant complaints about their child not listening to them but only to their father. Also discussed was the nature of proper punishment for a specific deed, reacting to dirty words, answering parents back, the problem of the screaming child, the screaming mother, and the difficulty which parents experienced when they set limits, if they felt that professionals would want them to be more permissive.

With the pre-adolescent and older child the issue of discipline was discussed by a guest lecturer in relation to the following topics: How do I get my pre-adolescent to do what I want him to do. What about my child fighting. My child's concern or lack of concern about clothes. Problems about helping or not helping with homework. Getting children to do their chores. Allowances. Sloppiness in the pre-adolescent period. Bedtimes and curfews. Day-dreaming. Bad companions. Being too aggressive versus being too compliant. Answering back. Name-calling. Arguments over simplest requests. The use of cars and the proper age for dating. Etc....

A different orientation with regard to the issue of sex education was also adopted. Along with some of the usual topics such as: where do babies come from, and differences between boys and girls, other areas were introduced including the following: What should you do if the child does not ask questions about sex. The implications of masturbation at various ages. Sex play. The child observing the parents having intercourse. Homeosexual activity. Dirty jokes. Should the parents pry into the child's sexual thoughts. Early dating. Should parents condemn pre-marital relationships of any sort. The use of contraceptives.

All of these topics were used to supplement and extend the syllabus given in APPENDIX "D" so as to increase the range and flexibility of the training approach and provide those who might adopt it with a greater variety of alternative topics from which to select.

The second shift in original plans concerned the recruitment of participating agencies. The main problem was that the number of applications received fell short of the 18 places available. To resolve this situation, the geographic 1,000 mile limitation which had been used to determine the location of participating agencies in the first year was extended to include all areas of the United States. In addition, FSAA also found it necessary to visit, or talk by phone, with the executives of a number of agencies to encourage their participation in the second year of the program. By means of these measures the necessary trainees were obtained and the original schedule of the project was maintained.

There are two reasons that may account for this difficulty in recruitment during the second year of the program. First, the most interested agencies had already been included in the first year. Originally only 24 agencies had responded positively to recruitment efforts and the first year had involved more than 18 of these agencies.

cont'd...



Second, and perhaps most important, the agencies themselves were concerned about the month required by the training, which was lost to the agency, and also the various traveling expenses involved. In any case, having obtained the necessary participants the training program itself was conducted along the same lines as previously described.

At the end of the three week and one week sessions the Terminal Reaction Forms were again administered. These data are tabulated in Tables 8 and 9.

These reactions seem to parallel those of the first year trainees, emphasizing the need for further work on group processes and dynamics, and criticizing the more formal lecture and seminar presentations. The general level of satisfaction with the experience continues to appear high.

It should be noted that the opinions of the trainees, while interesting, were not necessarily valid. Though they did not like the lectures or seminars as much as other features of the program it does not follow that these activities were any less helpful since there is no clear relationship between enjoyment and behavior change.

In this regard the trainers themselves had the definite impression that the seminars served an important function, though they did agree with the trainees that the lectures by outside speakers were not as helpful in all cases as they might have been. This difficulty arose out of the need to integrate a general presentation by an outside expert with an intimate and continuous training experience with which the speakers were relatively unfamiliar. However, it should also be remembered that these outside speakers may have been convenient scapegoats. One could criticize them without directly attacking either one's fellow group members or the training staff, who met with the group from day to day.

At the end of the two year period the Training Director summarized the experience of the training in the institutes in the following terms:

The first year group seemed to find that the seminar sessions were exceedingly helpful because it gave them a chance to work through their own ideas with regard to parent group education leadership at their own pace, and in their own terms. The second group of social workers, on the other hand, seemed to be more inclined to want more didactic discussion rather than the open type of seminar. It is also interesting that the first year group seemed much more concerned with the research procedures than the second group, who accepted them more or less without question.

The Training Director further reported that in establishing the training program the two trainers primarily responsible for the seminars and the running of the institutes had as their main purpose the inculcation of the philosophy of parent group education, and secondarily the development of skills necessary to implement this philosophy. These ends were achieved through various didactic lectures. At the

cont'd....

TABLE 8

TERMINAL REACTIONS OF TRAINEES  
(Second Year, First Training Session)

1. Which aspects of the training experience were most helpful?	
Observation and discussion.....	15
Content lectures.....	8
Technique lectures.....	8
Filmstrip.....	5
Case history.....	4
Discussions.....	1
2. Which aspects were least helpful?	
Theoretical presentations of outside speakers.....	14
Case record.....	5
Large discussion groups.....	4
Seminars.....	1
Discussions of therapy vs education.....	1
3. Which aspects require further emphasis?	
Observation of one group through 3 meetings.....	6
Recruitment.....	5
Group dynamics, leadership technique.....	5
Focus on specific techniques.....	4
Difficult individuals.....	2
Relationship of child development to group education.....	2
Relationship of agency project to group education.....	1
Relationship of casework to group education.....	1
Special group.....	1
No response.....	1
4. In which aspects of parent group education do you feel least prepared?	
Group dynamics, leadership technique.....	12
Difficult individuals and specific problems.....	5
Recruitment.....	2
Practical experience.....	1
Education vs therapy.....	1
Meaning of child development to parents.....	1
Unable to evaluate.....	1
None.....	1

cont'd...

## TABLE 8 cont'd...

## 5. In which do you feel best prepared?

Group techniques.....	13
Objectives and principles.....	6
Agenda gathering.....	2
Initial meeting.....	2
All.....	1
Recruitment and arrangements.....	1
Relation of child development to parents' concerns.....	1
Don't know.....	1

## 6. In general do you feel that the training program is worthwhile?

Yes.....	16
Yes, but not intellectually satisfying.....	1

\*\*\*\*\*

TABLE 9

TERMINAL REACTIONS OF TRAINEES  
(Second Year, Second Training Session)

## 1. Which aspects of the training experience were most helpful?

Group observation and discussion.....	11
Specific presentations.....	8
Sessions with CSAA staff.....	2
Film presentation.....	2
Field visits.....	2
Supervision.....	1
Techniques, lectures.....	1
Leader's role.....	1
Content lectures.....	1

## 2. Which aspects were least helpful?

Theoretical presentations of outside speakers.....	7
Case records and case material.....	3
Lectures on child development.....	3
Case material.....	1
Discussion of plans for next year.....	1
Some misunderstandings of concepts.....	1
Small sub-group discussions.....	1
No response.....	1

## 3. Which aspects require further emphasis?

More observation and discussion.....	7
Leadership technique and group dynamics.....	4
Refinement of techniques (focus, exploration, balance).....	4
Recruitment.....	2
Definition of terms and concepts.....	1
Better film clip.....	1
Copies of material presented.....	1
No response.....	1

## 4. In which aspects of parent group education do you feel least prepared?

Practical experience.....	10
Technique of leadership and group dynamics.....	4
To examine the topic in depth.....	2
Definition of concepts.....	1

cont'd...



TABLE 9 cont'd...

## 5. In which do you feel best prepared?

Group techniques and leadership.....	8
Relationship of child development to parents' concern.....	5
Handling the difficult person.....	2
Developing group cohesiveness and rapport.....	1
Exploring facts and material.....	1
Recruitment and initial meeting.....	1
All.....	1
Don't know.....	2

## 6. In general do you feel that the training program is worthwhile?

Yes.....	13
Mixed feelings.....	1
Probably.....	1

\*\*\*\*\*

same time the trainers felt that in order for this material to become part of the armamentarium of the caseworker's skills, and for them to fully appreciate the depth and meaning of this particular methodology, the trainees needed the opportunity to integrate the material in relation to themselves in terms of what they thought this approach would mean for the client group to be served. This was the end to be served by the "open seminar." It was during this seminar that it was felt that the trainees had the opportunity to raise their own questions which often required them to examine their personal reactions to the experiences that they were being presented with during the three week and one week follow-up institutes. What might have seemed disorganization to the trainees during these seminars, was essential so as to allow these personal questions to emerge. In this way the group members would have the experience of learning from one another in a process of looking at various sides to questions that they themselves had asked, and in terms of the reactions that they were also encountering within themselves and each other. This was all, of course, under the leadership of the training staff, who would help to clarify issues and to get across the salient points of philosophy or technique. It was felt also that it was necessary to handle some of the "content issues" in the same light, partly to increase the trainees' already substantial background in this area of personality and social development, but also to help them become aware of ways of handling issues that parents and youngsters might be facing.

During this process the trainers were in a constant dilemma; namely when to step in and give the answer as they themselves saw it, and when to help the group continue to pursue an issue that had become anxiety-provoking or apparently unrelated to the skill under discussion. It was felt that as a result of observing the trainers' behavior during this process the trainees would be able to appreciate the intricacies and feelings aroused in a parent group education series, and also to feel more at home with the many reactions engendered in this process, both as participants and as future leaders. It was also felt that as a result of this experience they would gain a greater sense of the process of change that could take place in a group such as the ones they were being prepared to lead.

### The Parent Groups

After each group of trainees had participated in the initial three week institute they returned to their home agency and proceeded to recruit members for the two parent groups they were to conduct. As might be anticipated, regardless of training and discussion, this process required a variety of approaches and in some cases a good deal of ingenuity. A number of examples illustrate the range of techniques employed.

In one instance the trainee, after finding it very difficult to recruit low-income people in housing projects, got the cooperation of one of the community organizers for the housing authority. She then went knocking on doors with him in a very dilapidated, slovenly section of the Negro community in the south. She spoke with each person

cont'd....

in these homes individually, assured them of transportation facilities or reimbursement of costs of transportation to the agency for attending the group meetings. Following this procedure she was able to recruit a group. In order to help maintain group attendance she also arranged with an appropriate local radio station to make announcements on the day before the meeting, and on the day of the meeting, to remind the group members to attend.

Another trainee, also attempting to recruit from a low-income area, found it necessary to sit down in a park frequented by young mothers and began conversations with them. Through these talks she was able to gather together a group interested in a parent education series. In order to recruit another group this trainee arranged with a local college for sociology majors to get field work credit for baby sitting in order to free the parents to attend meetings.

In another instance a trainee attempted to recruit a group of parents on A.D.C. She got permission from the agency personnel to meet with such a group of mothers and interpret the program to them. She also arranged with the Welfare Department to supplement their income during the life of the group, so that they would be able to have funds to cover coming to meetings and whatever other expenses attendance at meetings might entail. It is interesting that in this situation when the parents had a choice of meeting within their local community or outside, they preferred to have the experience of dressing and traveling to attend the meetings in another part of town, which provided them with an important social outlet.

In another situation, agency board members arranged for the trainee to meet with a group of workers within a small industrial plant to interpret parent education to them. In this way she was able to establish a group of blue collar working parents.

In one mid-west community the worker, with the aid of a local minister, recruited members, including the minister's wife and the minister, to form a group of low-income persons attending the church. She did this by knocking on doors with the minister and interpreting the program to the parishioners. In order to make it somewhat easier for the people to maintain their attendance, a baby sitting service was provided and a hot dinner served.

One agency invested a great deal of time, effort and money to prepare a brochure for distribution within the school system as part of their recruiting drive. This approach was very successful in reaching middle and upper income groups within that community.

In another situation a large group of fathers and mothers met in a parochial school for an evening meeting. From this larger group those parents who showed any interest in parent education were formed into a smaller, more permanent group.

cont'd.....



Finally, one group was formed through one worker's previous involvement as a consultant with a local Parents Without Partners group. They were reorganized by her to discuss the problems they faced in bringing up their children in an incomplete family structure.

While these illustrations are helpful in establishing the limits of the recruitment process, they are not necessarily typical. For this reason each trainee, during the first year, was asked to complete a Recruitment Questionnaire to describe the experience which they underwent in the process of obtaining group members and the degree to which group members attended groups faithfully after they had been recruited. The data obtained from this questionnaire are summarized in Table 10.

The following general picture emerged from their pooled experience: In 86% of the instances the community was initially notified about the parent education program through the media of newspapers, letters, personal contacts or group contacts. Telephones, radio and television were employed minimally.

However, not all sections of the community were given equal attention. Of the more than ten sections that were contacted, community centers and organizations, social agencies, churches and synagogues, and schools, accounted for 71% of the total. In 78% of the cases the contact was made either through personal or agency connections. Only 22% of the contacts were made at the request of special groups.

In 41% of the agencies, the trainees took primary responsibility for the recruitment procedure. The agency director and board committees together accounted for another 31%.

The recruiters reported that they met a wide variety of different problems, but they expressed little unanimity as to the nature of the problems themselves. However, when asked about those aspects of the recruitment process for which they were unprepared, 47% agreed that they found the interpretation of the program to potential participants generally difficult. More specifically, 72% agreed that low, as compared to high, income groups required much greater preparation and cultivation if recruitment was to be successful.

In terms of actual group attendance on the average about 7% of the parents who had registered failed to attend one of the two groups given in each agency during this time period. Four groups were forced to disband due to poor attendance. However, in practically all groups some form of follow up was necessary, generally either by phone or letter, in order to maintain the group attendance at a reasonable level.

Finally, the trainees reported that on the average they were given about 13 hours a week released time by their agency to work on the parent education program. However, a small minority reported that they received more than 36 hours per week, including nights, weekends, etc. For them the parent education was more than a full time program.

cont'd....



TABLE 10

RECRUITMENT AND ATTENDANCE

1.	How did you notify the community about the parent group program? (e.g., newspapers, television, flyers, personal contact)	
	Written material. . . . .	22
	Face to face contact . . . . .	22
	Communication systems (TV - Radio - Telephone). . . . .	7
2.	On which sections of the community did you concentrate your recruitment efforts? (e.g., community centers, schools, general public; - low-income, high-income, - organizations such as PTAs, religious groups)	
	Community organizations. . . . .	12
	Religious organizations. . . . .	8
	Schools. . . . .	7
	Low-income . . . . .	5
	General public . . . . .	2
	Urban areas . . . . .	1
	Suburban areas . . . . .	1
	High income . . . . .	1
	Middle income . . . . .	1
3.	On what basis did you make this selection? (e.g., personal contacts, agency contacts, requests from special groups)	
	Agency contacts . . . . .	10
	Personal contacts . . . . .	8
	Requests from special groups. . . . .	5
4.	How many parents responded from each of the kinds of groups and organizations that you approached?	
	Organizations. . . . .	11
	Face to face contacts. . . . .	7
	Responses from communication media . . . . .	6
	Irrelevant answers. . . . .	5
5.	Who in your agency was actively involved in the recruitment process?	
	Trainees. . . . .	13
	Agency director . . . . .	6
	Caseworkers . . . . .	4
	Board members . . . . .	4
	Consultants . . . . .	2
	No response . . . . .	3

cont'd. . . .

TABLE 10, cont'd.

6. What were the major difficulties that you encountered in the recruitment process?

Criteria for group recruitment ineffective . . . . .	5
Insufficient training . . . . .	4
Inadequate publicity . . . . .	4
Insufficient time . . . . .	3
Environmental factors . . . . .	2

7. For what aspects of the recruitment process were you unprepared?

Difficulty in interpreting program . . . . .	8
Difficulty in interesting other agencies. . . . .	3
Need for adequate planning in terms of time and location. . . . .	2
Conflict with agency policy . . . . .	2
Recruiter's insecurity . . . . .	2

8. Did you encounter different problems in the recruitment of low as compared to higher income parents? If so, please describe the differences.

Need to cultivate more in lower income area . . . . .	13
Irrelevant answer. . . . .	4
No difference . . . . .	1

9. How many parents were registered for the group but failed to attend? (Two groups combined)

0 . . . . .	3
1 - 6 . . . . .	13
7 - 12 . . . . .	6
13 - 16 . . . . .	1
No response . . . . .	1

10. Did any of your groups dissolve due to poor attendance?

No. . . . .	9
Yes . . . . .	4

11. Was any follow-up required in order to maintain group attendance?

Yes . . . . .	14
No . . . . .	2
Phone call or letter . . . . .	15
Face to face contact . . . . .	2

12. How much released time did your agency provide to enable you to develop and conduct the parent groups?

0 - 10 hours . . . . .	4
11 - 20 hours . . . . .	8
21 - 30 hours . . . . .	1
31 - 40 hours . . . . .	3

-----

### The Background Characteristics of Parent Group Members

The major quantitative impact of the project was on the members of the various parent groups formed by the participating agencies. During the two years of their existence almost 1600 parents became members of these groups. The background characteristics of these parents are summarized in Tables 11 and 12. Each group of trainees has two sets of two groups; one set was recruited after the three week institute.

In an analysis of those people reached during the first year's program, it was found that of the 831 individual participants in all of the groups, 747 had never had any experience at all in a parent education group, 68 had had experience in a family life education group although the type of group was not indicated. Sixteen of these 831 participants made no response. This, of course, is an overwhelming percentage of people who had been reached by parent education for the first time. It is also interesting that 559 had never availed themselves of either a family agency service or mental health agency service of any sort. In addition, it is worth noting that of the 831 participants, 218 fell into a low-income category.

In general the statistics summarized in Tables 12 and 13 indicate that a broad range of parents were enrolled in the parent groups, suggesting that the implications of the current project may be quite general.

A comparison of the second year parents with the first indicates that the general character of both samples was quite similar. The second year could therefore be viewed as a replication of the first, with the added opportunity for further testing of the procedures and techniques developed during the previous year.

In an effort to further clarify not only the distribution of characteristics but their inter-relationships, all scalable parent member background variables were inter-correlated. The matrix is given in Table 13. Six significant correlations were obtained. White group members tended to have better jobs than Negroes (-.35); Negro group members tended to have more children than whites (.31); amount of schooling correlated quite highly with level of occupation (.52); younger parents were more likely to have predominantly young children (.42) which is scarcely surprising; higher job status was associated with having fewer children (-.27) and reduced age range of children (-.24); and catholics tended to have more children than protestants (.20). It is fair to say that none of these relationships are unexpected. Collectively they tend to suggest that the sample of parents studied were fairly similar to a national sample in terms of the relations between their background characteristics.

It is not feasible in the present context to describe the experiences of particular parent group members, since there are almost 1600 from which to choose. Further, the nature of their experiences are only available as they were filtered through the memories of the trainees and their supervisors. Our effort was rather to assess certain general aspects of each group experience.

cont'd...

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF FIRST YEAR GROUP MEMBERS

	<u>Group I</u>	<u>Group II</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1. RACE			
1. white . . . . .	142	122	264
2. negro . . . . .	55	35	90
3. puerto rican . . . . .	6	--	6
4. no response . . . . .	219	252	471
2. PARENTAL STATUS			
1. mother . . . . .	364	354	718
2. father . . . . .	46	51	97
3. grandmother . . . . .	1	2	3
4. married n/child . . . . .	1	--	1
5. single n/child . . . . .	1	--	1
6. no response or other . . . . .	9	2	11
3. JOB			
1. semi-skilled, unskilled . . . . .	84	134	218
2. clerical, sales, skilled . . . . .	119	127	246
3. professional, managerial, office propl	46	144	290
4. no response . . . . .	73	4	77
4. AGES			
1. 16 - 20 . . . . .	2	--	2
2. 21 - 25 . . . . .	27	16	43
3. 26 - 30 . . . . .	72	76	148
4. 31 - 35 . . . . .	107	112	219
5. 36 - 40 . . . . .	94	91	185
6. 41 - 45 . . . . .	54	63	117
7. 46 - 50 . . . . .	36	35	71
8. 51 - 55 . . . . .	9	10	19
9. 56 - 60 . . . . .	7	1	8
10. 61 - 65 . . . . .	2	1	3
11. 66 - + . . . . .	--	2	2
12. no response . . . . .	12	2	14
5. EDUCATION			
<u>Grammar School</u>			
1. 5 - 6 . . . . .	7	6	13
2. 7 - 8 . . . . .	31	23	54
<u>High School</u>			
3. 9 - 10 . . . . .	49	39	88
4. 11 - 12 . . . . .	153	189	342
<u>College</u>			
5. $\frac{1}{2}$ - 2 years . . . . .	43	65	108
6. 3 - 4 years . . . . .	97	59	156
<u>More than College</u>			
7. $\frac{1}{2}$ - 1 year . . . . .	17	18	35
8. 2 - 4 years . . . . .	7	6	13
9. no response . . . . .	18	4	22

cont'd.....



TABLE 11, cont'd.

	<u>Group I</u>	<u>Group II</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
6. RELIGION			
1. Protestant . . . . .	261	267	528
2. Catholic . . . . .	101	92	193
3. Jewish . . . . .	40	28	68
4. Others, none, no response . . . . .	20	22	42
7. NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
1. . . . .	43	33	76
2. . . . .	118	127	245
3. . . . .	106	122	228
4. . . . .	77	56	133
5. . . . .	52	36	88
6. . . . .	8	18	26
7. . . . .	8	9	17
8. . . . .	5	5	10
9. . . . .	1	--	1
10. . . . .	1	2	3
11. . . . .	2	--	2
no response . . . . .	1	1	2
8. FAMILY COMPOSITION			
1. Pre-school children . . . . .	98	77	175
2. Mixed. . . . .	91	130	221
3. School children. . . . .	228	200	428
4. No response . . . . .	5	2	7
9. PREVIOUS MEMBERSHIP IN PARENT GROUP			
1. Yes . . . . .	36	32	68
2. No . . . . .	376	371	747
3. No response . . . . .	10	6	16
10. PREVIOUS USE OF SIMILAR SERVICES			
1. Yes . . . . .	123	113	236
2. No . . . . .	273	286	559
3. No response . . . . .	26	10	36

-----

TABLE 12

BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS OF SECOND YEAR GROUP MEMBERS

	<u>Group I</u>	<u>Group II</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1. RACE			
1. white . . . . .	153	150	303
2. negro . . . . .	88	89	177
3. puerto rican . . . . .	--	--	--
4. no response . . . . .	159	145	304
2. PARENTAL STATUS			
1. mother . . . . .	355	349	704
2. father . . . . .	43	32	75
3. grandmother . . . . .	--	--	--
4. married n/child . . . . .	--	--	--
5. single n/child . . . . .	--	--	--
6. no response or other . . . . .	2	3	5
3. JOB			
1. semi-skilled, unskilled	73	148	221
2. clerical, sales, skilled . . . . .	166	85	251
3. professional, managerial, office, pro- prietor . . . . .	141	132	273
4. no response . . . . .	20	19	39
4. AGES			
1. 16 - 20 . . . . .	1	0	1
2. 21 - 25 . . . . .	31	25	56
3. 26 - 30 . . . . .	96	100	196
4. 31 - 35 . . . . .	69	75	144
5. 36 - 40 . . . . .	91	82	173
6. 41 - 45 . . . . .	55	50	105
7. 46 - 50 . . . . .	42	40	82
8. 51 - 55 . . . . .	11	7	18
9. 56 - 60 . . . . .	3	4	7
10. 61 - 65 . . . . .	--	1	1
11. 66 - + . . . . .	--	--	--
12. no response . . . . .	1	--	1
5. EDUCATION			
<u>Grammar School</u>			
1. 5 - 6 . . . . .	--	--	--
2. 7 - 8 . . . . .	20	25	45
<u>High School</u>			
3. 9 - 10 . . . . .	35	36	71
4. 11 - 12 . . . . .	143	177	320
<u>College</u>			
5. $\frac{1}{2}$ - 2 years . . . . .	47	68	115
6. 3 - 4 years . . . . .	73	100	173
<u>More than College</u>			
7. $\frac{1}{2}$ - 1 year . . . . .	15	16	31
8. 2 - 4 years . . . . .	8	7	15
9. no response . . . . .	6	8	14

cont'd.....

TABLE 12, cont'd

	<u>Group I</u>	<u>Group II</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
6. RELIGION			
1. Protestant . . . . .	239	236	575
2. Catholic . . . . .	66	78	144
3. Jewish . . . . .	61	45	106
4. Others, none, no response . . . . .	34	25	59
7. NUMBER OF CHILDREN			
1. . . . .	49	53	102
2. . . . .	131	114	245
3. . . . .	107	99	206
4. . . . .	59	65	124
5. . . . .	30	26	56
6. . . . .	8	12	20
7. . . . .	6	10	16
8. . . . .	6	3	9
9. . . . .	3	2	5
10. . . . .	1	--	1
11. . . . .	--	--	--
no response . . . . .	--	--	--
8. FAMILY COMPOSITION			
1. Pre-school children . . . . .	104	110	314
2. Mixed . . . . .	93	91	184
3. School children . . . . .	203	183	386
4. No response . . . . .	--	--	--
9. PREVIOUS MEMBERSHIP IN PARENT GROUP			
1. Yes . . . . .	62	43	105
2. No . . . . .	336	340	676
3. No response . . . . .	2	1	3
10. PREVIOUS USE OF SIMILAR SERVICES			
1. Yes . . . . .	113	111	224
2. No . . . . .	273	263	536
3. No response . . . . .	14	10	24

- - - -

TABLE 13

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GROUP MEMBER CHARACTERISTICS

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>
1. Race	--	-.12	-.35*	.09	-.16	-.10	.31*	.19	-.18	-.12
2. Parental Status			.03	.14	.15	.05	-.02	-.03	.05	-.10
3. Job Status				-.08	.52*	-.07	-.27*	-.24*	.04	-.06
4. Age					.00	.02	.04	.42*	-.13	-.05
5. Schooling						.00	-.15	-.20	-.06	.03
6. Religion							.20*	.03	-.06	.07
7. Number of children								.13	-.02	.10
8. Age range of children									-.06	-.09
9. Previous membership in parent groups										.07
10. Previous use of social services										--

\*.01 level of significance



Toward this end all group members were asked at the last group session to evaluate on a standardized form the effects which the parent group meetings had produced upon them. At the same time each trainee evaluated each of the group members on a similar form, so that two separate estimates were available for each parent. In addition, the parents were asked to make certain general comments about the utility of the group experience and to suggest possible improvements in its design. Table 14 summarized the responses to questions concerning specific aspects of individual experience in the groups.

An inspection of these data suggests three general conclusions. First, both the parent group members in rating themselves, and the trainees in rating the parent group members, felt that the experience was more than moderately helpful in increasing their knowledge about, attitude toward, and behavior related to parent-child relations and also their self-understanding. Second, the parents were slightly more positive in their reaction to the experience than the trainees, who showed a more conservative bias! Finally, one notes a reasonable rank ordering in both trainee and group member ratings on the variables being evaluated. Most improvement was experienced in relation to knowledge and least in terms of new behavior, as might have been predicted.

In order to extend the implications of these findings three groups made up exclusively of low-income members were compared with other kinds of groups on these eight ratings in order to determine how much benefit such groups received from the parent education experience in comparison to the total sample. Somewhat surprisingly it was found that for all such groups on all variables the average rating indicated greater change than for the total sample included in the study. A sign test comparing the low-income groups with the total sample exceeded a .001 significance level. This finding would seem to indicate that when such groups are formed they are unusually successful, though the previous data on recruitment indicated that such groups are inherently more difficult to form.

In interpreting these results it is of some interest to examine the inter-correlations between the variables involved. A 10 by 10 correlation matrix is presented in Table 15 which includes not only the 8 ratings but also the attendance record of the individual and a rating of the severity of his communication difficulties in the group.

Several clear findings are suggested from an inspection of this matrix. First, the self ratings and the trainees ratings are highly inter-correlated. Either halo error is strong or changes on all characteristics tend to occur together. The former alternative seems the more likely of the two. Second, when one compares the correlations between sets of ratings (trainee and parent group member) one also notes quite high correlations, with the same variable tending to have the highest correlation in the two sets of ratings, i.e., parent's self rating of knowledge shows its highest correlation with the trainees' rating of their knowledge, and so on. Third, the amount of group member attendance is strongly related to the amount of change perceived by the trainees. Group members actually attended an average of 5.8 meetings.

cont'd.....

EVALUATION OF THE EFFECT OF THE GROUP EXPERIENCE  
ON PARENT MEMBERS

Ratings by Parents

	<u>Average Rating</u>
1. Knowledge of parent-child relations. . . . .	2.8
2. Attitude toward their children . . . . .	3.0
3. Behavior with their children . . . . .	3.4
4. Self-understanding . . . . .	3.1

Ratings by Group Leader of Parents

1. Knowledge of parent-child relations. . . . .	3.5
2. Attitude toward their children. . . . .	3.7
3. Behavior with their children . . . . .	3.9
4. Self-understanding . . . . .	3.7

NOTE: All ratings were made on a scale ranging from 1 through 7.

A rating of 1 indicated that the group experience produced a great improvement, 4 a moderate improvement, and 7 no improvement on the given characteristic.

TABLE 15

THE RELATION BETWEEN DIFFERENT ASPECTS  
OF THE PARENT GROUP EXPERIENCE

	<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>	<u>6</u>	<u>7</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>10</u>
<u>Parent rating</u>										
1. Knowledge of parent-child relations		.59	.57	.59	.57	.41	.41	.34	-.28	.04
2. Attitude towards their children			.60	.51	.37	.51	.44	.30	-.27	-.04
3. Behavior with their children				.57	.36	.38	.43	.30	-.23	.00
4. Self-understanding					.38	.40	.41	.46	-.23	-.08
<u>Trainer ratings of parents</u>										
5. Knowledge of parent-child relations						.84	.79	.80	-.64	-.12
6. Attitude towards their children							.89	.79	-.61	-.17
7. Behavior with their children								.78	-.60	-.21
8. Self-understanding									-.55	-.11
9. Number of group sessions attended										.12
10. Intensity of parents communication difficulties in the group										--

The average correlation between the trainee rating and attendance is .60. However, there is little relationship between attendance and the trainees self ratings on the same variables. Here the relation averages about .25. This discrepancy occurs in spite of the fact that the two sets of ratings are quite highly correlated, which suggests that the trainee and group member ratings are responding to quite different influences. The trainees seem to be making the implicit assumption that group members receive benefit from the group in direct proportion to their exposure to it, whereas the trainees do not.

Finally, a rating made of the severity of the parent's communication difficulties in the group was found to relate to lack of improvement in a) attitude toward, and b) behavior with their children. These relations held only for the ratings of the parents made by the trainees but not by the self ratings of the parents themselves. Though the findings are reasonable, not too much weight should be put upon them, because of the small correlations involved.

In addition to these questions related to the individual, each parent was asked to indicate the nature of any topics they wished might have been covered in the group and also to suggest any changes in the group experience which they felt might be beneficial.

In general the parents did not agree to any great extent on any particular topics that had been overlooked. In relation to changes in the group experience the great majority were satisfied and had nothing specific to suggest. However, 26% made suggestions about the physical arrangements of group meetings so as to make them more convenient and accessible. Smaller numbers (6%) wished for more structure in the groups. In general these requests are not surprising.

At the conclusion of each group experience each trainee was asked to fill out a Group Description Form to summarize the group experience particularly as it related to training for parent education leadership. The data from these questionnaires are summarized in Tables 17, 18 and 19.

These data suggest a good deal of unanimity in the description of the leadership function in these groups. The central notion is one of facilitating positive group goal setting through the interaction process. In the second year the descriptions of leadership function became more varied emphasizing, in addition to this basic point, the importance of achieving a focus and also broadening the discussion as the occasion demands.

In relation to the kinds of leadership techniques actually employed by the trainees, some overlap is noted with the answers to the last question. Continual emphasis is placed upon focussing the discussion and/or broadening it where desirable, supporting members who are uncertain and providing feedback and a summary of progress, as well as occasionally supplying specific information about child rearing practices. This description is well within the definition of the purposes of the project.

cont'd.....



GROUP DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

(First Set of Groups of First Year Trainees)

1. What are the functions of a group leader?	
Establishing goal through positive group interaction. . . . .	34
2. What were the major leadership techniques which you employed?	
Eliciting specifics and focussing . . . . .	17
Broadening discussion. . . . .	15
(facts, alternatives)	
Summary and recapitulation. . . . .	12
Supporting and underscoring . . . . .	11
Agenda gathering. . . . .	7
3. For which aspects of parent group leadership were you insuffi-	
ciently prepared?	
Leadership role . . . . .	16
Group process . . . . .	16
Content (physical and social development) . . . . .	4
4. For which aspects were you well prepared?	
Process . . . . .	17
Technique . . . . .	17
Content . . . . .	9
No response . . . . .	1
5. What were the major gaps in the parents' understanding of parent-	
child relations and child development?	
Parents' lack of self-knowledge . . . . .	5
Sibling rivalry . . . . .	4
Importance of child's feelings. . . . .	3
Sex education . . . . .	2
Environmental problems. . . . .	2
Discipline . . . . .	1
Effect of divorce . . . . .	1
Peer relationships. . . . .	1
No response. . . . .	32

-----

TABLE 17

GROUP DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

(Second Set of Groups of First Year Trainees)

## 1. What are the functions of a group leader?

Establishing goal through positive group interaction. . . . . 23

## 2. What were the major leadership techniques which you employed?

Broadening discussion . . . . . 19

Eliciting specifics. . . . . 13

Supporting and underscoring group members' attitudes. . . . . 8

Agenda gathering. . . . . 7

Summary and recapitulation. . . . . 5

## 3. For which aspects of parent group leadership were you insufficiently prepared?

Leadership role and awareness . . . . . 17

Specifics . . . . . 6

Child development . . . . . 3

Handicapped children. . . . . 1

Adoptive parents . . . . . 1

## 4. For which aspects were you well prepared?

Content. . . . . 24

Process. . . . . 13

Techniques . . . . . 6

## 5. What were the major gaps in the parents' understanding of parent-child relations and child development?

Confusion about parents' values and expectations of themselves. 8

Unevenness in physical and social development. . . . . 8

Confusion about sex education . . . . . 7

Impatience of child's feelings about self and others. . . . . 6

Environmental problems. . . . . 3

Sibling rivalry . . . . . 1

-----

TABLE 18

GROUP DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

(First Set of Groups of Second Year Trainees)

## 1. What are the functions of a group leader?

Establishing goal by positive interaction. . . . .	23
Focussing . . . . .	20
Broadening. . . . .	17
Supply information. . . . .	15
Conceptualize . . . . .	10
Summarize . . . . .	8
Exploration of coping methods . . . . .	7
Interpretation of goal and explanation of process . . . . .	5
Supporting. . . . .	5
Leading . . . . .	4
Agenda gathering. . . . .	3
Recruitment . . . . .	2

## 2. What were the major leadership techniques which you employed?

Focussing, eliciting specifics. . . . .	22
Broadening . . . . .	18
Supporting, underscoring . . . . .	13
Summary, recapitulation. . . . .	11
Agenda gathering . . . . .	10
Clarifying . . . . .	8
Supplying information. . . . .	8
Setting atmosphere conducive to learning . . . . .	4
Stressing feelings . . . . .	4
Initial introduction and explanation . . . . .	3
Avoiding specific answers . . . . .	1
No response . . . . .	1

cont'd.....

TABLE 18, cont'd.

## 3. For which aspects of parent group leadership were you insufficiently prepared?

Content . . . . .	9
Focussing, explanation, balancing . . . . .	8
Recruitment, explanation of process . . . . .	6
Fluctuation in size of group. . . . .	5
Dominant member . . . . .	4
Leadership role . . . . .	4
Distinguishing between education vs therapy . . . . .	4
Dealing with low socio-economic group who have realistic problems. . . . .	3
Group process . . . . .	3
First meeting . . . . .	2
Resistance to method . . . . .	2
Timing . . . . .	1
None . . . . .	1

## 4. For which aspects were you well prepared?

Content . . . . .	10
Process . . . . .	9
All . . . . .	6
Leadership role . . . . .	5
Technique . . . . .	5
First meeting . . . . .	4
Recruitment . . . . .	2
None. . . . .	1
No response . . . . .	1

## 5. What were the major gaps in the parents' understanding of parent-child relations and child development?

Normal child development. . . . .	19
Ambivalence about child's growing independence. . . . .	11
Discipline, punishment . . . . .	9
Parents' lack of self knowledge . . . . .	6
Sexuality, sex education. . . . .	6
Multiple causation of behavior. . . . .	3
Parental feelings and expectations. . . . .	3
Importance of child's feelings. . . . .	3
Sibling rivalry . . . . .	2
Hostility and aggression. . . . .	2
Environmental problems. . . . .	1
Fears and their meaning . . . . .	1
Death. . . . .	1
Role of the father . . . . .	1

-----



TABLE 19

GROUP DESCRIPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

(Second Set of Groups of Second Year Trainees)

## 1. What are the functions of a group leader?

Interpretation of goals and explanation of process.....	17
Supplying information.....	10
Focussing, eliciting specifics.....	10
Clarification.....	9
Exploration of coping methods.....	8
Supporting.....	6
Leading.....	6
Broadening.....	5
Recruitment.....	4
Identification.....	1
Work with difficult person in group separately.....	1

## 2. What were the major leadership techniques which you employed?

Focussing and eliciting specifics.....	16
Clarifying.....	14
Summary, recapitulation.....	9
Supplying information.....	9
Broadening.....	6
Stressing feelings.....	5
Checking the group.....	4
Use of name cards, identification.....	3
Exploration.....	3
Balancing.....	2
Providing information.....	1

cont'd...

TABLE 19 cont'd

## 3. For which aspect of parent group leadership were you insufficiently prepared?

Group process.....	7
Content.....	5
Refinement of technique.....	5
Lack of confidence in handling group.....	4
Leadership role.....	4
Small group.....	3
None.....	3
Recruitment.....	2
The difficult person in group.....	1
Timing of information and educational concepts.....	1
Low socio-economic group to be handled differently.....	1

## 4. For which aspects were you well prepared?

Process.....	13
Content.....	12
Technique.....	12
All.....	4
Recruitment.....	4
Leadership role.....	3
Awareness of goals.....	2
Differently prepared.....	1

## 5. What were the major gaps in the parents' understanding of parent-child relations and child development?

Ambivalence about child's growing independence.....	7
Parental feelings and expectations.....	6
Sexual growth.....	4
Parents' lack of self knowledge.....	4
Discipline.....	4
Multiple causation of behavior.....	4
Environmental problems.....	3
Appropriate behavior for age range.....	2
To individualize relation to children.....	2
How to set limits.....	1
No response.....	3

\*\*\*\*\*

In relation to the questions concerning those aspects of leadership which the trainees felt they had been well prepared or not well prepared to handle, the responses suggest that they were least prepared to actually take the leadership role and to cope with group process as a continuously emergent phenomena. However, they were well versed in terms of knowledge and understanding about these matters. In other words, they seem to indicate that they ran into difficulty when translating what they had been taught into a prescription for action. They did not complain about what they had learned or how they had learned it, but were aware of the need for more experience in being able to utilize this information under operational conditions. Presumably this ability would be enhanced by further leadership experience.

Finally, in relation to the gaps which the trainees noted in group member knowledge about child development and parent-child relationships a variety of observations were forthcoming. It is difficult to summarize these observations neatly, though confusion about sex education, conflicting parental expectations, normal patterns of child development and ambivalence about the independence of the growing child tended to recur rather frequently.

#### Correlates of Successful Leadership in Parent Groups

One recurrent question in any training process concerns the personal characteristics that relate to success in leadership performance. In order to undertake such an analysis, background information and a criteria of success is necessary. It will be recalled that the first group of trainees had been the object of extensive study, including several sets of self ratings, ratings made by the trainers, supervisors, the PARI, a personality test and a Background Information Form. All of this information could be used prognostically if some criteria of success were available.

With this in mind, at the end of the group experiences the project director and one other staff member rated each of the trainees on the degree of change which they had undergone in leadership ability during the project and the general level of their final attainment. These ratings were made jointly and were based on knowledge of the trainees' performance through the weekly written records that they had submitted, conferences with their supervisors, and through direct personal contact. The ratings were then correlated with all of the information already available about the trainees. The resulting matrix is given in Table 20.

Based on these correlations and those already generated in the earlier analysis of the relation between the independent variables, (see APPENDIX "F") a multiple correlation was obtained and a regression formula derived for purposes of providing a mathematical approach to the prediction of success as a parent group leader.

cont'd.....

THE CORRELATION BETWEEN TRAINEE PRE-TRAINING MEASURES  
AND RATINGS OF THE EFFECTS OF THE TRAINING

	Final level of attainment	Degree of change
1. Age	.34	-.27
2. Marital Status	.25	.13
3. Number of children	-.15	.36
4. Number of courses in understanding the individual	.20	-.14
5. Number of courses in parent-child relations	.25	-.12
6. Number of courses in education	-.14	.26
7. Number of courses in social science	.28	.27
8. Average length of employment	.46	-.29
9. Amount of experience	.51	-.11
10. Sex	.19	-.17
<u>Trainees self ratings</u>		
11. Assertiveness	-.15	.37
12. Sociability	-.43	.24
13. Emotionality	.07	.31
14. Intelligence	-.25	.34
<u>Agency Head ratings of trainees</u>		
15. Assertiveness	.18	-.40
16. Sociability	-.21	-.02
17. Emotionality	.60	-.14
18. Intelligence	-.42	.02
<u>Trainers ratings of trainees</u>		
19. Assertiveness	.03	-.03
20. Sociability	-.08	.16
21. Emotionality	.05	.01
22. Intelligence	-.23	.10
<u>Trainees self ratings</u>		
23. Knowledge about parent education	-.07	-.53
24. Attitude toward parent education	.16	.07
25. Ability to lead parent groups	-.11	-.04
<u>Trainers ratings of trainees</u>		
26. Knowledge about parent education	.14	.14
27. Attitude toward parent education	.15	.09
28. Ability to lead parent groups	.00	.40
29. Self understanding	--	.27
<u>Personality questionnaire</u>		
30. Ascendence	-.01	-.17
31. Sociability	.25	.05
32. Emotional stability	-.06	.03
33. Objectivity	.39	-.22
<u>P A R I</u>		
34. Authoritarian control	.14	-.10
35. Hostility-rejection	-.05	.30
36. Democratic attitude	.05	-.21
.....		
37. Final level of Attainment	1.00	-.44
38. Amount of Change	-.44	1.00

NOTE: a correlation of .48 is significant at the .05 level  
with an N = 17.

\*\*\*\*\*



In generating the multiple regression equations all correlations between the final measure of trainee attainment and other background variables which exceeded .40 were utilized. For the equation involving change in leadership performance over the training period, all relations over .30 were employed. While not all of these relationships exceeded statistical significance at the .05 levels it was felt desirable to err on the side of including too many rather than too few variables, since the number of strong relationships and the sample size were both small.

A multiple correlation of .70 was obtained between final status as a parent group leader measured in terms of trainer ratings and five predictor variables. These included length of employment, amount of experience, a high initial rating by trainers on sociability, a low rating on emotionality by agency supervisor, and a high rating on intelligence also by agency supervisors. It is striking that all of these measures, except the third, could be obtained without ever meeting the trainee. They represent information readily attainable and therefore could be employed as a practical as well as statistical approach to the prediction of success. The multiple regression correlation which best expresses the way in which each of these measures should be weighed to achieve the most accurate prediction using the variable numbers given in Table 20 for the X "subscripts" is given as follows:

$$Y = 2.1 + .07X_8 + .09X_9 + (-.12) X_{12} + .25 X_{17} + (-.11) X_{18}$$

Of perhaps greater interpretive importance are the beta weights for each variable which provide their relative contribution to the multiple regression coefficient when all are placed on the same standardized scale. They are, in order of variables given above: .21, .23, .11, .27, and .14. Length of experience, stability of employment and lack of emotionality on the job are the major predictors in this equation.

In terms of predicting amount of change produced by the training process, a quite different set of interrelationships seems to exist. Utilizing 7 predictor variables a multiple correlation of .81 was obtained, which is quite high considering the unreliability of the rating of change which they were predicting. The variables entering into this relationship along with their beta weights are: number of children in the trainees family (.27), lack of assertiveness as rated by trainers (.43), lack of emotionality as rated by trainers (.003), lack of intelligence as rated by trainer (.16), high degree of assertiveness as rated by agency supervisor (.53), high trainee self-estimate of knowledge about leading parent groups obtained after training but before group leadership (.29), and low trainer estimate of trainee ability to lead groups made after three week training but before groups were led (.07). These correlates of change are quite remarkable. First they suggest that positive ratings by trainers are negatively correlated with change. This can be explained on the basis that those with higher initial ratings may not benefit as much because they have less room for improvement.

In addition it is possible that the trainers might give most attention to those whom they think require it and for this reason they undergo the change. One should also note the possibility that agency needs

cont'd...

may have selected trainees to participate in the program for two quite different reasons. On the one hand they may have chosen them because of their potentiality as parent teachers. These are the kinds of people that the first regression equation may be detecting. Second, they may choose those who need extra help, hoping that the training experience will strengthen the quality of their overall performance. It is this type of person that the regression equation predicting change may be describing. Further research is needed to clarify this possibility.

In regard to other predictor variables the situation is somewhat different. The relation between change and size of the trainees' family is interesting but its interpretation is not obvious. The relationship between agency supervisor ratings of assertiveness and trainee self-ratings of knowledge seem relatively reasonable. Finally, it is quite remarkable to note that the variables with the highest beta weights in this equation are lack of assertiveness as rated by trainers (.43) and high degree of assertiveness as rated by the agency head (.53). This is a remarkable illustration of the importance of situational inconsistency in the prediction of change.

The multiple regression equation that relates the 7 predictor variable to the change rating using the same numbers as given in Table 20 for X "subscripts" is given as follows:

$$Y = 4.01 + .29X_3 + .46X_{11} + .005X_{13} + .18X_{14} + (-.80)X_{15} + (-.63)X_{23} + (-.07)X_{28}.$$

In summary, the data provide a striking illustration of the difference between the meaning of the final level of attainment and absolute amount of change. This difference has been demonstrated indirectly in the previous analysis. A direct approach to the problem would be to determine the correlation between these two ratings. In these data this correlation was -.45. Trainees who had the highest final rating tended to have changed the least during the training process.

This finding highlights a basic dilemma in the selection of candidates for training programs. Should one look for persons of superior ability whom one cannot influence to any great extent, but of whom one can be proud at a later time as products of the training program. Or should one select persons of lesser attainments who are more amenable to change. Is the purpose of such a program to put forth impressive trainees or exert the greatest influence on those who participate within it. This is the administrative issue which the previous statistical analysis has highlighted.

#### The Overall Evaluation of the Project

At the conclusion of each year of training activities the three parties most closely associated with the project, the trainees, the trainers and the agency administrators, were questioned about its outcome and asked to provide their evaluation of its success. The data obtained from these sources are of particular interest because they

cont'd....

represent a reaction to the total project and its long range impact, rather than, as in previous material, responses to short term aspects of the experience. These long range assessments constitute the most appropriate criteria for an estimate of the success of the demonstration and are congruent with the definition of the project as envisioned in the original proposal. The first set of data of this type was obtained from the trainees on a questionnaire labeled "Trainee Final Reaction Form." The responses to this form are presented in Table 21.

The results indicate that the trainees devoted almost two days a week to the parent group activity. In the great majority of instances other members of the agency staff were receptive to and interested in the parent education program. The trainees felt that they themselves had greatly benefited from the program, especially in terms of the knowledge, understanding and skill which they had attained concerning leadership in parent groups. A variety of suggestions were made about improvement of the program in the future, centering around dissatisfaction with guest lectures previously reported on the Daily and Terminal Reaction Forms.

Approximately 75% of the trainees reported having made a presentation about the program to their board, regional meetings, and the like. Others indicated that they intended to do so. The trainees felt that their main contribution to the agency during the period of the participation in the project was in helping the agency extend its services to new clients and to new types of clients not previously approached.

In relation to the projection of future programs in family life education a majority of the second year group, and roughly 80% of the first, welcomed the opportunity for such training. If it occurred the first year group would place emphasis on increased study of group techniques whereas the second year group would focus more specifically on the problem of training others to be leaders, a shift in emphasis probably produced by the concurrent development of the ENABLE Project, to be described in a later section. The content of these further experiences was to emphasize group process rather than sharing information or a lecture approach. It is clear that, at least from the trainees' viewpoint, the central need is not further work on parent-child relations but rather a better understanding of how adults function in group situations, so that they may act as leaders to facilitate the process more successfully.

The second major kind of data was obtained from the CSAA training staff on a "Trainer Final Reaction Form." The data from this questionnaire are summarized in Table 22.

In about 80% of the cases the CSAA training staff felt that the agencies had been successful, or at least partially successful, in conducting the parent education program. In only one case did they feel that a complete failure had occurred. In general, relatively little internal agency opposition was noted. Outside circumstances were favorable in roughly 60% of the situations. Where difficulties occurred they were due either to insufficient funds or problems of intergroup relations in the local community.

2  
cont'd.....



TABLE 21

TRAINEES FINAL REACTION FORM

	<u>1st</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>2nd</u> <u>Year</u>
1. How much time per week have you devoted to parent group activities?		
Less than 7 hours.....	2	2
7-14 hours.....	9	6
14-21 hours.....	2	5
21-28 hours.....	2	1
Full time.....	0	1
No definite response.....	1	-
2. What kinds of responses did you receive from other members of your agency in relation to the parent education program?		
Positive interest.....	15	13
Ambivalence.....	3	2
Little or no interest.....	2	-
No response.....	1	-
3. From your viewpoint are there any ways in which you think the training process could be shortened or simplified without reducing its effectiveness?		
Two institutes each week.....	7	-
Fewer guest lectures.....	2	8
Smaller groups, limited discussion.....	4	5
More individual consultations.....	3	1
One institute only.....	-	2
More observations.....	-	1
More written material.....	-	1
Less written records.....	-	1
No change.....	4	3
Don't know.....	-	1
No response.....	1	-
4. Do you feel that you have grown professionally as a result of your participation in the program? Please describe:		
Yes.....	15	12
Increased knowledge.....	10	3
Understanding of group process.....	4	5
Skills.....	-	11
Understanding of healthy aspects of personality.....	-	4
Helped in casework.....	-	2
No response.....	1	-

cont'd...



TABLE 21, cont'd...

	<u>1st</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>2nd</u> <u>Year</u>
5. Have you made, or do you plan to make any presentations describing the parent education program to groups such as your Board, regional meetings, etc.		
Yes.....	16	12
Family Service Societies.....	8	1
Counseling agencies.....	1	3
Social Agencies, Schools.....	4	9
Newspapers, T.V.....	3	2
Mental Health Groups.....	3	1
Board and Staff.....	-	12
Not yet.....	4	1
6. In what way do you see your agency making use of your experiences during the last year? Please describe:		
Public Relations.....	1	2
Extending Agency Service.....	13	9
Increasing number of groups.....	7	5
Reaching new types of groups.....	6	5
Conduct training programs.....	1	2
Evaluation of agency programs.....	1	1
7. Do you feel in need of further training, consultation, supervision, etc., to be able to carry out the plans you have outlined above?		
Yes.....	14	8
More consultation and training to become teacher.....	3	1
Consultation about specific problems.....	9	0
Assistance from local resources.....	1	0
No.....	2	6
Don't know.....	-	1

\*\*\*\*\*

TABLE 22

TRAINER FINAL REACTION FORM

	<u>1st</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>2nd</u> <u>Year</u>
1. To what extent was the family agency successful in initiating and integrating the parent education program into ongoing services?		
Totally successful.....	2	8
Partially successful.....	9	4
Not at all.....	-	1
Don't know.....	2	-
No response.....	2	-
2. What kinds of resistances within and outside the family agency had to be overcome in the development of this program?		
a. Within the agency (e.g. board members, staff members)		
None.....	11	9
Conflict within Board.....	1	2
Conflict between Board and Administration.....	3	1
Conflict because of newness of program to staff.....	-	1
b. Outside the agency (e.g. inter-agency coordination of programming and training, response from community)		
None.....	8	8
Partial resistance (i.e. from white community; Negro community favorable).....	4	3
Resistance because of insufficient planning.....	3	2
3. Do you think the parent group program will remain a permanent service within the family agency?		
Yes.....	14	10
No.....	-	1
Don't know.....	1	2
a. Describe the form that you think the program will take:		
New group to be recruited.....	18	7
In-service training to be instituted.....	3	1
Plan for one night sessions.....	-	2
Limited continuing program.....	-	3

cont'd...

TABLE 22 cont'd...

	<u>1st</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>2nd</u> <u>Year</u>
4. Did you observe any evidence of professional growth on the part of the trainee sent by the agency during the course of the training process?		
A good deal.....	7	7
Some.....	8	5
Can't say.....	-	1
a. Please describe:		
Greater awareness of psychodynamics.....	9	3
Understanding of group process.....	6	7
Greater self-awareness of worker.....	-	2
5. Did you as a trainer benefit in any way from working with the trainee?		
A lot.....	13	4
Some.....	-	6
No.....	2	3

\*\*\*\*\*

In 85% of the cases the staff felt that the parent education program would remain a permanent part of the agency program. In only one case did they feel that such continuity would not occur. In virtually all instances the trainers felt that the trainees had benefited from the experience though their level of enthusiasm was slightly less than that exhibited by the trainees themselves in the previous questionnaire. The trainers also reported that in more than 80% of the trainer-trainee relationships, the trainers themselves benefited and learned from participating in the project.

The third and final major type of evaluative data was obtained from the administrators of the participating agencies on a form titled "Administrators Questionnaire." These data are summarized in Table 23.

These data are of particular interest because the agency administrators were not directly concerned with the project and had little reason to be biased in its favor beyond such general politeness as may characterize their professional relationships. Nevertheless, their reactions seem to closely parallel in direction and degree those of the trainees and trainers previously reported.

More than half the directors reported that the parent education program had an appreciable impact on their total agency program. While there was some concern expressed about the financial sacrifices required by the agency in order to participate in the program, it is clear that the program aroused positive interest and relatively little resistance within the agency from other community agencies or interested parties. The great majority reported that the program enabled the agency to reach new groups of clients, provided the agency with unusual publicity, and helped it to provide, in turn, needed preventative services. Virtually all of the administrators felt that the project had been helpful in fostering the trainees' professional growth as well as increasing her contribution to the agency program. A variety of other responses are reported concerning program modifications and future projections that do not permit of easy verbal summary here. In general however, it is clear that the reaction of agency administrators was very positive and that the program helped them realize a number of agency goals which they held to be relevant and of importance to the nature of their own enduring task.

#### Follow Up of Administrative Reactions

In order to obtain data on the long range impact of the demonstration it was decided to re-interview all heads of agencies that had participated in the first year of training during the late Fall of 1965. Over a year had elapsed since these agencies had formally ceased to participate in the program. The intervening experience could be taken as a reasonable indicator of the endurance and potential for growth inherent in the training program as it was translated into action in the various agencies involved.

cont'd.....



TABLE 23

ADMINISTRATORS QUESTIONNAIRE

	<u>1st Year</u>	<u>2nd Year</u>
1. Did the parent education program have any impact on the nature or extent of the other services which your agency offers?		
Yes.....	5	8
Appreciable impact.....	3	-
Not noticeably.....	6	3
Too soon to assess impact.....	2	2
a) Stimulated agency staff.....	2	0
b) Good public relations in community.....	1	0
c) Still strong preference for group counseling rather than family life.....	1	0
d) Individual caseload of workers had to be reduced.....	-	4
e) Revision of agency program.....	-	2
f) Increased self-referrals.....	-	1
(NOTE: Questions 2 through 7 were not asked of the first year group)		
2. What was the relative cost of the parent education program as compared to casework service? Please explain basis of your estimate:		
No estimate was made.....	-	5
Less expensive per person served.....	-	2
More expensive per person served.....	-	3
About the same.....	-	3
3. Were financial sacrifices entailed for your agency in supporting the parent education program?		
Yes.....	-	5
No.....	-	8
4. What reactions, if any, did other community agencies in your area have to the parent education program?		
Positive.....	-	9
Cautious interest.....	-	2
No reaction.....	-	1
Rejection by some agencies.....	-	1

cont'd...

TABLE 23 cont'd

	<u>1st</u> <u>Year</u>	<u>2nd</u> <u>Year</u>
5. What kind of resistance had to be overcome?		
a. Within agency:		
None.....	-	8
Resistance to change.....	-	2
Concern about time lost from casework.....	-	3
Resistance from Board because of doubts about value of program.....	-	1
b. Outside agency:		
None.....	-	7
Recruitment.....	-	3
Resistance to extended 8 week sessions.....	-	2
Resistance to trainee as opposed to agency workers....	-	1
Resistance to pay for extra cost.....	-	1
6. Did the program		
a. Enable you to reach new groups of clients?		
yes.....	-	10
maybe.....	-	1
no.....	-	2
b. Provide useful publicity for agency?		
yes.....	-	13
c. Enable you to provide needed preventive service?		
yes.....	-	10
maybe.....	-	2
don't know.	-	1
d. Help change public image of agency?		
yes.....	-	7
no.....	-	3
don't know,	-	3
e. Help meet a demand for this type of service that existed in community?		
yes.....	-	11
no.....	-	2
7. Did the workers receiving group leadership training show evidence of professional growth as a result of the training experience?		
Yes.....	-	13
Please explain:		
Better understanding of group dynamics.....	-	8
Greater self-assuredness.....	-	1
Greater self-awareness.....	-	2
Greater effectiveness.....	-	2
Better grasp of child development.....	-	2

cont'd...

TABLE 23 cont'd

	<u>1st Year</u>	<u>2nd Year</u>
8. In your opinion was the caseworker's participation in this project of value to the agency? Please explain:		
Yes.....	7	3
Enables agency to provide service in community.....	9	6
Worker's education and experience with training group has stimulated others.....	2	5
All participants had positive experience.....	1	0
9. What did you hope that the worker would be able to add to your agency's services as a result of this experience?		
Participation helped to improve service.....	4	0
Plan to offer leadership for parent group discussions on a greater scale.....	2	1
A more realistic and efficient means to meet family problems.	4	0
A new service.....	3	7
Higher quality of service.....	3	1
Had hoped that existing family life education program could be carried out more skillfully.....	2	5
10. Please describe if you have any plans for the worker to transmit the knowledge she has gained from the program to other members of the agency. If there are no plans, please tell us what you see as the future of the program to your agency.		
Hope that other members can be introduced into parent education project.....	4	8
To continue service in community based upon demand.....	2	1
Expect parent group educational program to continue and to train others.....	2	4
Agency is concerned to find a person who can devote all his time to family life education.....	1	0
Currently proposing to Board a plan to invite staff members to study together to develop skills.....	4	1
To be leader of a selected group.....	1	0
Have already selected additional program.....	1	0
Hope to help clients to become involved in individual relationship.....	1	0
No plans at present.....	2	0

cont'd...

TABLE 23 cont'd

	<u>1st Year</u>	<u>2nd Year</u>
11. Please indicate whether you think that any other training, supervision or consultation is needed for the worker in order to most effectively carry through your plans as outlined above.		
Worker could use further training.....	7	4
Worker's participation was of value.....	4	0
Further training not essential at present.....	4	3
Supervision by CSAA to continue by letter correspondence....	1	0
Consultation.....	1	4
Help needed for worker to transmit knowledge.....	-	1
Don't know.....	-	2
No response.....	1	0
12. What is your overall estimate of the value of the parent education program conducted in your agency?		
Worthwhile experience.....	11	6
Future experience will give answer.....	3	0
CSAA could have taken more advantage of knowledge provided by FSAA.....	1	0
Board and staff value this program; should be enlarged.....	1	7
Parent education program reached new groups.....	1	2
Family life education should become available in community..	1	1
13. If you had this type of parent education program before, how did the present service relate to and supplement your previous activities?		
Did not have program before.....	10	1
Deepened interest in program.....	3	1
Comparison at this time not possible since last experience a few years ago.....	1	1
This service enabled us to reach new groups.....	2	1
Increased and enhanced professional knowledge and understanding of group.....	2	4
Enlarged program.....	-	4
Continued existing program on about same level.....	-	1
No response.....	1	1

\*\*\*\*\*



In order to undertake this follow up interview, members of the CSAA and FSAA research and training staff met in Detroit with agency heads during the 1965 national FSAA convention. Those few agency heads who did not attend the convention or were not available, were later contacted by phone or interviewed through the mail.

For the sake of facilitating data comparisons this interview closely followed the previously utilized Administrators Questionnaire. The results of the data analysis are given in Table 24.

In all but two of the seventeen agencies contacted the original trainee was still employed and the parent education program was still active. In most cases this activity had continued in its original form though in four agencies new leaders had been trained by the trainee. The workers continued to devote roughly two days to parent education activities.

In general, the agencyheads responded that they were satisfied with the assistance that had been given them during the project by both participating national agencies, FSAA and CSAA, though several reported lack of clarity regarding initial expectations. An interest in continued contact with the national agencies for consultation, and additional training seminars, was also noted.

In virtually all instances the agency boards had been involved in the program, or positively interested in it, and other workers were generally aware of its form and function. In more than half the agencies, the program had produced a long range impact on other services with particular reference to reducing case loads through a group approach and the supplementation of already existing services.

Only two situations were noted in which community groups had other than positive reactions. In the great majority of instances new client groups including low-income, school and church groups were reached for the first time through the program. Further, most agencies' heads felt that the program enabled them to provide preventative services, help change the public image of the agency and satisfy, or help to create, a need for this type of preventative service in the community. All but one director reported that the experience benefited both the trainee and the agency, and that they would choose to participate in it again if they had the opportunity.

In general, the follow up interview supported the initial positive impression generated by the Administrative Questionnaire which had been completed immediately after the training experience. It suggests that the initial impression was a lasting one and that the long range impact of this large scale demonstration in leadership training for parent group education was highly successful in the eyes of those most directly involved in the program.

cont'd.....

FOLLOW-UP INTERVIEW OF AGENCY ADMINISTRATORS

1. Is the worker who was trained still with the agency?	
Yes.....	15
No.....	2
2. Is the parent education program still active?	
Yes.....	15
No.....	2
a. If yes, describe its nature, extent, leadership.	
Involves various groups.....	10
Training of other leaders.....	4
Mainly one night stands.....	1
Teenage groups.....	1
Emphasis on low-income groups.....	1
b. If yes, how much of worker's time is devoted to it?	
Almost full time.....	2
1/3 to 1/4 time.....	2
1/2 time.....	4
Less than 1/4 time.....	4
Don't know.....	4
c. If yes, has the program evolved or altered during the last year?	
Yes.....	5
Involving other agencies.....	4
Training of other leaders.....	2
Reduction of number of parent-group sessions.....	1
Increase in number of parent-group sessions.....	1
Involving new groups.....	2
More acceptance in agency.....	1
No.....	8
New Project.....	1
3. Was sufficient assistance offered by CSAA and FSAA during the training process?	
Yes.....	14
No.....	3
If not, indicate what else ought to have been done:	
Better guidelines regarding expectations and timing of supervision..	3
More time.....	1
Focus too limited in terms of parental concerns.....	1
Better and more formalized communication between staff and executive	1
Indications for future programming in agency.....	1

cont'd...

4. What role should these two agencies play in the future support of the local effort of your agency?

Further consultation with CSAA about skills and techniques.....	7
Additional training seminars for old and new personnel.....	4
CSAA should train "training supervisors".....	2
Nothing further.....	2
Ongoing communications with other trainees.....	1

5. How involved were:

a. Board of Directors:

Fully.....	9
Positive interest.....	6
Limited involvement.....	1

b. Other workers aware of and interested in program:

Fully.....	5
Limited interest.....	6
Some resistance of staff.....	2
No response.....	2

6. Did the parent education program have any impact on the nature or extent of other services offered by your agency?

Yes.....	7
Reduced load of caseworkers.....	3
Supplemented existing services.....	2
Referral from groups to counseling.....	2
Helped shorten waiting list.....	1
Change in intake procedure to permit referral to group.....	1
Generated interest in group therapy.....	1
Demand for leaders exceeds supply.....	1
Loss of income to agency.....	1
Consultation role of agency.....	1
No.....	5
No response.....	2

7. What reactions did other community agencies have to the program?

Positive.....	14
Limited interest.....	1
None.....	2
Some conflict with other agencies.....	1
Negative.....	1

cont'd

## 8. Did your program:

## a. Enable you to reach new groups of clients in the community?

Yes (low-income, schools, PTA's, church groups).....	12
Not within agency.....	1
Through training program - yes.....	1
No.....	1
Somewhat.....	1
No response.....	2

## b. Enable you to provide needed preventative service?

Yes.....	11
Don't know.....	2
No.....	2
No response.....	2

## c. Help change public image of agency?

Yes.....	4
No.....	5
Too soon to know.....	3
Yes, but in a negative direction.....	1
No response.....	5

## d. Helped you to meet a demand for this type of service that existed in the community?

Yes.....	9
No demand.....	4
No response.....	4

## e. Necessitate your creating a demand in the community for this type of service?

Yes.....	9
No.....	4
No response.....	4

## 9. In your opinion was the caseworker's participation in this project of value?

## a. To your caseworker:

Yes.....	16
Don't know.....	1

## b. To your agency:

Yes.....	16
No.....	1

## 10. If you had to do it all over again would you choose participation in this project.

Yes.....	15
Ambivalence because of loss of caseworker's time to project.....	1
No, because of question about value of program.....	1

\*\*\*\*\*



### Conclusions and Implications

Within its own terms there can be little doubt that the demonstration attained its intended objectives. A substantial number of trainees selected from social agencies throughout the country were trained as parent group leaders, developed their own parent groups and proceeded to work with almost 1600 parents drawn from all social classes and backgrounds. Follow-up interviews indicated that almost all of the programs continued to function actively a year after the conclusion of the training program and questionnaire material collected from all interested parties indicated a highly favorable response to the training program and to the effects of parent education within the broader scope of agency functioning.

It should be noted in this connection that it was not the intention of this project to undertake a formal evaluation of pragmatic effectiveness. Such an evaluation would have required control groups and a degree of precision in the manipulation of the program that did not seem feasible. Thus no claim can be made to have scientifically proven the efficacy of the approach. Such a test must await a further study. It would, in fact, seem highly desirable to undertake such a study in view of the apparent success of the program. But since that was not the intention of the present project, it is not fair to expect from it what it was not intended to produce.

A related issue which needs to be mentioned concerns the research strategy that was pursued. The complexity of the operation and its developmental quality made it appropriate to use extensive questionnaire material with heavy reliance on open ended statements in order to elicit full expressions of reactions and opinions. These kinds of data were suitable for answering the general questions that were at issue. However, they did not lend themselves to more precise comparisons. By way of contrast, during the early stages of the project, a carefully formulated effort was made to study the performance of the first group of trainees during the first three week institute. These data were discussed previously and serve to indicate the kinds of analysis that might have been more generally possible if this approach had been pursued throughout the project. Thus, within that limited three week period it was possible to explore the precise nature of the changes that were produced, the background characteristics to which they were related and the influences which the position of the observer had on the interpretation of what had been observed. Through the use of instruments of a precise and quantitative character it was possible to obtain scientific answers to some interesting questions.

It was not possible to pursue these studies and still perform the basic task of general assessment to which the project was committed, but enough was done in this direction to indicate the richness of material that was available. The implication of this aspect of the general experience is clearly that this demonstration ought to be the prelude to a series of more precise investigations designed to clarify how and to what extent the different facets of the training process produce an effect, and to study in much greater detail the process by which program innovation occurs in the participating social agency.

cont'd.....

The success of the total enterprise serves only to highlight the importance of more focused efforts in this area in the future. Activity without scientific understanding is only half an effort, just as study without application is ultimately an unacceptable luxury.

It is also necessary to note the importance of flexible funding arrangements in the conduct of a demonstration project such as has been reported here. Our experience in relation to this issue was on the whole quite satisfactory. The staff of NIMH was most understanding in permitting us to make minor alterations in the use of monies previously earmarked for different purposes. However, it should be stressed that the productive use of any large scale training experience necessitates supplementary sources of funds so that one can take advantage of unexpected opportunities for training innovations and data collection. It is on such occasions that a relatively small amount of money drawn from independent sources can play an important role in enhancing the qualitative character of the final product.

Most final reports conclude with a statement that the work ought to be extended in various directions. Here unfortunately the matter often ends. In relation to this project the story is quite different. This demonstration has, in fact, become the prelude to a much larger undertaking. Thus both as a conclusion of this effort and as an indication of its future implications, we will end this report with the description of a new beginning, which was linked to the experience that has been described and serves to carry it much further, both in terms of numbers of parents served and the kinds of agencies involved within the total process.

### Project ENABLE

In the Fall of 1964 when the first year of training was formally completed and the early research reports and informal reports of agency reaction were at hand, the project director and the FSAA coordinator began to discuss what kind of program could be developed to take advantage of the apparent enthusiasm for this type of parent education service in family agencies. The War on Poverty was in its initial stage and it was natural to look with particular interest at the low income parents who had been served in parent discussion groups in the preceding year, before national attention had been focussed so dramatically on this segment of the population. As has been noted previously, these particular parents while more difficult to recruit, received especial benefit from the parent group experience. They had rarely if ever made use of such service before, perhaps because it had not been readily available to them or perhaps because many social workers had assumed that discussion groups were not an appropriate service for parents believed to be non-verbal, unconcerned with understanding themselves and their children better, but interested only in tangible assistance. Experience in the project indicated that a need existed and that low-income parents would use such service if available.

cont'd.....



After several preliminary discussions, the National Urban League was invited to consider joining with the Family Service Association of America and the Child Study Association of America to think further about such an expanded program, because of its knowledge and experience in working with minority groups.

Throughout January and February 1965 various meetings in New York and in Washington led finally to the submission in March of a preliminary proposal to the Research Demonstration, and Training Department in the Community Action Program of the Office of Economic Opportunity. Two drafts and several amendments later, in September 1965, Project ENABLE was approved, the first national project sponsored by voluntary social agencies to be so funded.

Interest in the Project was certainly generated by the unique aspect of three national organizations, each with a different program emphasis but with many common goals, joining forces to "forge a new tool" for service to parents. The OEO concurred in an assumption of the sponsoring agencies that many Poverty Programs would fall short of their goals if parents were not helpfully involved and if parental attitudes and home situations did not change while children and young people took part in Headstart, Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Groups, etc. Thus everyone was agreed that parent education had a key role in the War on Poverty.

In the six months between the submission of the first draft and the funding of the Project, staff discussion and conferences with program consultants at OEO led to further definition of the contribution each agency could make to a parent education program specially designed for parents from poverty neighborhoods. The concept of a team approach which would meld the skills of parent education, family service, and community organization began to emerge. A training program was developed which would teach social workers in Family Service Agencies and Urban Leagues throughout the country to enable groups of parents to carry out their parental functions more effectively in a hostile environment and to find constructive ways of changing that environment.

CSAA continued to give leadership to this training program for national and local staff. Fourteen of the thirty five Family Service workers trained in the FSAA-CSAA Joint Project were recruited to become part of the national ENABLE staff. Six of them had been in the first year of the original project and eight in the second year. First called Trainers, they are now titled Area Supervisors. Additional training has been provided by CSAA and the other national agencies to prepare them not only to teach what they had learned, but to incorporate the new and expanded concepts of ENABLE. Two Area Supervisors work in a team with a Training Specialist based in CSAA and an Area Coordinator (a community organization specialist based in National Urban League) to plan for and to staff each Area Institute. They also supervise local ENABLE staff throughout the training period, and give consultation and assistance to agencies of the Area in interpreting and planning local programs, in providing follow-through service to the parent groups, and in building the new approach into on-going programs.

cont'd.....

The research aspects of the Project are divided into two major parts. A formal analysis of the process that characterized the conduct of the Project is to be conducted by the research staff of FSAA. The evaluation of the effectiveness of the Project will be conducted by Simumatics, a professional research organization unrelated to the three sponsoring agencies.

The first sessions of six Area Training Institutes were held in April 1966. More than 130 professional staff from 100 Family Service Agencies and Urban Leagues in 64 communities were involved. Thus in less than a year after the second year of training in the CSAA-FSAA Joint Project ended, the number of communities using the learning from that project has doubled and the number of staff in training has more than tripled. Further, during the first year of its operation it is conservatively estimated that over 10,000 parents will be involved in the ENABLE program.

Administration of a program involving three national voluntary agencies, 100 autonomous local affiliates, national, regional, and local offices of OEO, each with somewhat different needs, ideas, and problems has been incredibly complex. Strong conviction about the potential value of the program in the hearts and minds of boards, executives, and staff of all the agencies has been the essential ingredient in carrying the Project through the frustration and conflicts of planning and development to the present stage of operation. Much of this conviction stemmed from experience in the Joint Project reported here. Good use has been made of that experience in planning training programs, in adapting methods to serve the poor, in enlisting the interest of key people in support of ENABLE, but perhaps even more important has been the excitement and challenge which grew from the vision of better services derived from the NIMH Project, for which ENABLE serves as an epilogue and a dramatic extension.

\* \* \*

S77-6/20/66



A D D E N D U M  
to  
TERMINAL PROGRESS REPORT

Publications resulting from an Exploratory Project in Parent Group Education jointly sponsored by the Child Study Association of America and the Family Service Association of America under a grant from the National Institute of Mental Health, Number 1 R11 MH684-A1.

Recruiting Low-Income Families for Family Life Education Programs, by Carl A. Scott, program director, Child Study Association of America; presented at the 1964 Annual Forum of the National Conference on Social Welfare. (Published by the Child Study Association of America)

Comparison of Low-and-Middle-Income Families Utilizing Parent Group Education Services, by Oscar Rabinowitz, project director, and Ada M. Daniels, assistant project director, Child Study Association of America; presented at the 42nd Annual Meeting of the American Orthopsychiatric Association, March 1965.

The Consultation Process in Training for Mental Health Education Through the Use of Correspondence and Direct Observation, by Franklin C. Cohen and Mildred Rabinow, training staff, Child Study Association of America; presented at the 92nd Annual Conference of the National Conference on Social Welfare, May 1965.

Training in Parent Group Education as Seen by the Caseworker, by Grace W. Aarons, caseworker, Family Service of Memphis; presented at the 92nd Annual Conference of the National Conference on Social Welfare, May 1965.

